DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 920 SO 001 385

TITLE Studies on Protest and Dissent in American Life. With Teacher's Guide.

INSTITUTION Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass. Lincoln Filene System for Citizenship and Public Affairs.

PUB DATE 69

NOTE 101p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58

DESCRIPTORS *American Culture; *Civil Liberties; Civil Rights; Discussion (Teaching Technique); Economic Factors; Freedom of Speech; Inquiry Training; Political Socialization; Racial Discrimination; Religious Discrimination; Secondary Grades; Social Action; Social Attitudes; *Social Change; *Social Studies Units; Teaching Guides; *United States History

IDENTIFIERS Dissent; *Protest; Values Education

ABSTRACT

The five episodes from American life narrated in this unit attempt to show various methods of protest against different oppressions, ranging from revolt against the law by armed resistance, to getting an objectionable practice eliminated by a fresh interpretation of the Constitution through the courts. An important fact is pointed up--even though the Constitution gives us certain rights, we must demand them. If we do not claim our freedom from imprisonment for debts (Part I), our freedom from racial discrimination (Part II), our freedom to assemble and speak (Part III), to work under fair conditions (Part IV), and to practice or not practice our religious beliefs (Part V), others may take them away. A few of the general teaching objectives are: 1) to understand that political protest (and labor strikes) may be the result of intolerable economic conditions; 2) to understand that economic pressures among the poor may lead to rebellion; 3) to believe in the legal processes set up for redress of grievances; and, 4) to realize that changing a law by using the judicial process is difficult and yet is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights. Explanatory notes on the narratives, suggested discussion questions, a vocabulary list, and attitude and content relevant resources. Related documents are ED 053 015 through ED 053 017. (Author/JLB)

ED056920

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JOHN S. GIBSON

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

STUDIES ON PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CS 001 065

Program in American History and Civilization
Division of Secondary Social Studies

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Copyright © The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs 1969
Tufts University

PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE: PART I

A young and good-looking horseman approached the village of Great Barrington. He wore the buff-and-blue uniform of a captain in the Continental army. He had no baggage, but his steel sword was strapped to the saddle.

Perez Hamlin, after nine years away, was slowly riding homeward. He asked the first man he met where the tavern was. The man pointed.

"That looks more like a jail."

"Well, it is. The jail's in the ell of the tavern," said the passer-by.

Perez Hamlin rode up to the tavern, dismounted, went inside, and ordered a plate of pork and beans from the landlord.

"I saw many red flags on farmhouses as I was coming up this morning," Perez said. "You haven't got the smallpox in the county again, have you?"

"Them are sheriff's sales," said the landlord, laughing. "You'll get used to the red flag if you stay in these parts long. You ain't so far from wrong, though. I guess most folks as soon have smallpox in the house as the sheriff."

"Times are pretty hard hereabouts?" Perez asked.

"About as hard as they can be. It's worse in this here county, cause there's been no court for six or eight years, till lately, and no debts were collected. So they've kind of piled up. Only the parsons, lawyers, and doctors

ain't been sued; everyone else has. Business is lively for the sheriffs; they ride in carriages these days."

"Is the jail pretty full now?" Perez asked.

"Chock full," the landlord replied. "How I'll make room for the fellers the court'll send next week, I don't know."

"Do you expect a good many more next week?"

"Gosh, yes. The Court of Common Pleas never had so much business as this time. I calculate there's 700 cases to try."

"The devil!" exclaimed Perez. "What have they all done?"

"Oh, they ain't done nothing," replied the landlord; "they're nothing but debtors. There ain't no good locking them up. We never get rid of them. They have to stay till they pay up, and they can't pay as long as they stay. So we carry them out feet first."

"Why don't they pay up before they get in?"

The landlord stared at him. "Where are you from, anyway?"

"I'm from New York, last."

"I thought you couldn't be from around here. It doesn't matter how much property a feller has. It brings nothing for sale. The creditor buys it for almost nothing, and the farmer goes to jail for the balance. A man who's got a silver sixpence can buy a farm. Folks say there ought to be a law making property a tender for debts in place of money. The debts could be paid off

by selling the property at a fair value. But that's none of my business."

Perez finished his meal and asked to settle his account. From his pocket, he took out a roll of $5000 in Continental bills.

"Haven't you got Massachusetts bills? Those Continental bills aren't worth houseroom. If I'd have known, I wouldn't have given you anything to eat."

"Well, the government thought it good enough for soldiers' pay for their blood. If you don't take these, I can't pay you at all." Perez said.

"Let's call it a thousand for meal and drink. Haven't you got any cleaner than these?" the landlord asked.

Perez handed him another lot. "What difference does it make?"

"If they're clean, I can keep notes on the backs of them, and my wife can use them to write to her folks in Springfield."

Perez walked toward the door. He looked out at the ell of the building and asked, "Do you have any debtors from Stockbridge?"

"Why, yes. I have a prisoner who won't hold out too much longer, George Fennell."

"George Fennell! George Fennell isn't in this jail!" Perez was astonished. "He's my friend! I'd like to see him. Can I?"

The landlord hesitated. "Well, there could be no harm." Perez was let into the jail corridor. The smell of the jail was like a pig sty. The muggy

August day was oppressive outside--twice as much in the jail.

"There's another feller in here from Stockbridge." The landlord opened the door to a small 7-by-7-foot cell. Perez stepped into the cell. It was littered with straw, and the mold feeding on the moisture gave off a sickening odor. One man kneeling on the floor stared at Perez. Perez realized quickly that this man was not George, since he appeared very tall; George was short. He leaned over to speak to the other prisoner lying on the floor. But before he could rouse George, the tall prisoner clutched his arm and cried, "Perez, don't you know me?"

Perez looked at the filthy face and mat of hair and shaggy beard. He looked into his brother's eyes!

"God in Heaven!" Perez almost instinctively shrank from his brother's grasp. "Reuben, how long--?" His voice broke.

"I suppose I'm kind of thin and changed, so you didn't recognize me." Reuben smiled shyly, as was his nature. "I've been here a year. But I could get rugged again with a little nursing. Perhaps you've come to take me home?" Reuben asked expectantly, with a gleam of hope in his face. "Perez? Ha, Perez?"

"Reub, I didn't know you were here! I was going home. You know I haven't been home since the war. I just heard George was here."

"Where have you been all this time, Perez?"

"I had no money," answered Perez. "I've been wandering about. Who put you here?"

"Squire Woodbridge. I got in debt for seed and stock, and hard times came. I couldn't pay, so Woodbridge sued. I owe twenty-two pounds; nine pound for debt and the rest justices' and sheriffs' fees."

He pointed to the cell wall where he had calculated, in charcoal, the interest on the debt each day.

"I guess they'll have to cut out my heart pretty soon," Reuben stated matter-of-fact-like.

George Fennell then asked Perez if he could lift him from his deathbed in order to get a last look out through the small, barred window of the cell. Before he could do this, the landlord interrupted.

"Time's up," he said.

"You're not going to leave us now?" cried Reuben.

Perez asked to stay longer. "Sorry, you've been here ten minutes already. And no one's tending to the tavern."

"Cheer up, Reub." Perez could not meet his brother's eyes. "I'll get you out. I'll come for you," he whispered.

The door was shut and barred.

Captain Perez Hamlin rode his mount slowly toward Stockbridge, not noticing the late summer scenery.

A crowd had gathered on the green at Stockbridge. They were trying to decide who among them would be the one to ask the gentry sitting on the store piazza about the convention recently held in Lenox. The convention had been held to recommend important immediate changes in the Massachusetts constitution. Finally Ezra Phelps squared his shoulders and strode across the street. He took off his cap and timidly said, "Please, we'd like to know about the convention."

Squire Woodbridge scowled. "Tell your friends that the convention very wisely did nothing at all."

"Nothing?" Ezra felt a little courage. Despite his bulky frame and brute strength, he never questioned the squire.

"Nothing!" The squire softened a bit. "Except to punish all disorderly persons. And tell your friends to leave matters of government to their betters, or they'll find themselves with lash welts on their backs and set in the stocks."

Ezra was dazed when he confronted the crowd again.

"Nothing? Nothing about taxes?"

"Nothing about sheriff's fees?"

"Nothing about jailing?" they exclaimed.

"We were fools to have elected a General Court to do something for us. The people won't get right until they take hold and right themselves. I've been obliged to pay my debts, yet nobody pays me what is owed," one man said.

"If government ain't our business, why'd they teach us how to fight?" Ezra remarked.

Their representatives had let the people down. They felt their grievances would never be heard.

When Perez Hamlin rode through the Stockbridge green, the sun was down. The crowd had dispersed.

Word had spread that Perez had come home, but his homecoming was joyless. Mrs. Hamlin sensed Reuben's impending death, despite her other son's assurances that he would live, and the Hamlin farm was soon to be foreclosed. Perez paced the floors with clenched fists. With Ezra Phelps, who had no family among the villagers, he planned for Reuben's escape and the family's removal to the New York frontier.

Their private plans were soon changed, however. A few evenings later, Ezra appeared at the farmhouse door.

"Perez, come out here." Perez stepped into the dark.

"That was a nice plan you had to capture the squire as a hostage. But we ain't going to try it. Anyway, not alone." Ezra pulled at Perez and whispered, "The whole county of Berkshire's going to help us!"

"What do you mean? Are you drunk, Ezra?" Perez spoke soothingly.

"I know what I'm talking about! A feller just got in from Northampton and said the people in Hampshire county stopped the courts. Fifteen hundred men

with Captain Daniel Shays leading them! They stopped the judges. Anyway, they told the judges not to hold any more courts until the law was changed. So the judges adjourned. With so many fellers with guns, the judges thought this good advice."

"That means rebellion, Ezra."

"That's what it means, and it means God ain't dead yet."

Perez reflected on his own problem. "But what about Reub?"

"Don't you understand? Don't you think the Berkshire folks have as much spunk as the Hampshire fellers? You should be down at the tavern! You can call me a liar if there ain't more than a thousand men at Great Barrington to stop the court next Tuesday. And that jail's coming open or coming down!"

Ezra had reported the facts more or less correctly. Chief Justice Artemis Ward, a former General of the Army, had confronted a group of insurgents (as the rebellious crowds were called). He had been compelled to hold court in the tavern, but he adjourned it after three days. He made no judgments on debts.

But Ezra had exaggerated the number in Shays's force--there were 700 men. They were armed mostly with clubs and they faced a cannon mounted on the courthouse steps by the militia guard. From this time on, Shays insisted that each of his men wear a sprig of evergreen in his cap as his identification with the farmer's cause.

Ezra correctly anticipated the temper of the Berkshire folks.

Captain Perez Hamlin, who had assumed the leadership of the Stock-bridge group, estimated the crowd which gathered at Great Barrington at eight hundred, including women and children. Unlike Northampton, there were no militia at Great Barrington when Perez's group arrived there.

"There'll be no fighting today," he said. "Let off your muskets so there'll be no accidents."

By midday, the justices and the sheriff came toward the crowd gathered near the courthouse. They were dressed in fine black suits and silk hose, with silver buckles on their shoes.

"Make way for the Honorable Justices of the Court of Common Pleas!" cried the sheriff.

All was silent for a moment. Someone snickered from the far corner of the crowd. And then hoots and catcalls burst from the throats of the crowd. The awesomeness of the distinguished justices was gone; the crowd was no longer tongue-tied in the presence of their honorable betters.

A rotten egg broke on the sheriff's coat. An apple knocked a justice's hat off. The justice did not dare to pick it up. Justices and sheriff retreated.

Perez was on his way to the jail when he heard, "They're stoning the justices."

With his men, he rescued the justices and secured them safely in the

tavern. But his authority was questioned by the Barrington people. "Stand back. You've stopped the court. What more do you want?"

"What's to prevent them from holding court tomorrow as soon as we've gone? We want no more courts held until the laws are changed." This was the common sentiment.

"Leave it to me. I'll get you what you want," Perez replied. He went into the tavern where the justices were safely gathered. The faces of the crowd pressed against the windowpanes.

"Your honors," said Perez, "the people will not be satisfied unless you give a written promise to hold no more courts."

"Why do you speak for this rabble? You're a disgrace to that uniform! Do you know this is high treason?" exclaimed one justice.

"It wouldn't be the first time I've been guilty of that on behalf of my oppressed countrymen! The people are restless. If you can make better terms, you're welcome to try. They're about to come in."

Indeed they had overpowered the guard at the door. They had helped themselves to drink.

"Where's the paper? Ain't they signed yet?"

"It's all right, men; here's the paper," Perez said. Reluctantly, they had signed.

"We promise not to act under our commissions until the grievances--"

painfully they deciphered each syllable.

"What's grievances?" demanded one in the crowd.

"That's taxes and debts--of which the people complain." The statement was read again.

"What's redressed?"

"That's the same as abolished."

With this job finished, the crowd broke into the jail to free the debtors. The sick prisoners were placed in carts. Reuben was carried home, soon to die.

As they started back to Stockbridge, someone said, "It's a good day's work, Captain Hamlin, the best I've ever had a hand in, even if I get hanged for it."

Ezra was pleased, too. "Now as soon as the government hears what we did, they'll print a wagonload of bills and get them to us, so we can pay our debts."

In the eyes of the former revolutionary, Sam Adams, now a distinguished member of the Massachusetts Senate, the farmers were being irresponsible. While Ezra offered his solution to the problem, the Honorable Sam Adams suggested the passage of a Riot Act and with it suspension of habeas corpus so that men could be arrested and put in jail without bail or a court hearing.

The House of Representatives in the legislature was not ready to accept his recommendation, since many members recognized the existence of justified

grievances which had caused the disorders. In addition, they had to proceed cautiously. Each new consideration of the legislature produced active retaliation by the insurgents.

Governor Bowdoin was aware of this when he intercepted a circular letter allegedly signed by Daniel Shays. It said: "All those of us who stopped the court will be immediately punished. Assemble your men, armed and equipped with sixty rounds."

Another letter followed: "Our captive men taken to Boston have been tortured. Our cause is your cause. Don't give yourself a rest and let us die here. Your petitioners in the counties who have petitioned the legislature are not wicked men. And they are not a few."

The House soon passed the Riot Act. After the sermon on Thanksgiving Day, the people of Stockbridge had to listen to the new Act as part of the Governor's proclamation:

> All those involved in the late uprisings against the courts will be pardoned if they take the oath of allegiance to the state before January first. If you do not do so by that time, you will be arrested without bail at the Governor's discretion. All persons who do not disperse upon request after the reading of the Riot Act will receive 39 lashes and one year's imprisonment.

"Pardon for what, I'd like to know," Ezra blurted out in the meetinghouse. "I haven't done anything I'm ashamed of."

Perez agreed, "The more paper they waste on proclamations, the less

there's left for holding gunpowder."

The Stockbridge farmers would have been encouraged if they had heard Thomas Jefferson's reaction to the news of the rebellion. Always sympathetic with the farmers, he philosophized from the distance and safety of Paris:

> A little rebellion now and then is a good thing. The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants. It is its natural manure.

By the end of November so many had become slaves to their creditors that only a few people bothered to go to work. The idle drifted into the streets. Using the captured hat of the justice, they hanged him in effigy. Night after night, except when they took time out for a cornhusking, the youth serenaded the hated silk stockings--those who sided with the court and the justices. They made a bonfire from the destroyed fence of Squire Woodbridge's house. They made the Squire return household goods to a farmer whose possessions had been auctioned.

News arrived that the court at Concord had been stopped and that some of the militia had gone over to the side of the insurgents. And the crowd took heart; they broke into the tavern and helped themselves to drink.

Meanwhile Perez Hamlin was making plans to move to New Lebanon, New York. The village doctor who had come to look after Reuben, before Reuben's death, tried to persuade him not to go.

"I'm no longer their leader. It's none of my business what they do," said Perez.

"Yes, it is," the doctor said. "You can't wash your hands of the responsibility."

"If I were to stay, I wouldn't interfere. The people have a right to avenge their wrongs. I'll leave the rebellion to those who caused the rebellion," Perez replied angrily.

"Is that honorable?"

Perez's face flushed. "You're telling me it's my duty to stay so that I can be sent to the gallows and my brother sent back to jail? It's better that I go, for there are wrongs which must be avenged in my family, also."

The doctor could not argue with this last statement.

Events prevented Perez from leaving Stockbridge. He became the leader of the Stockbridge insurgents and eventually led them into rebellion. He was singled out as a Shaysite--a supporter of Shays--by the government and was pursued as an enemy.

But Perez protected those he knew in Stockbridge, even the hated silk stockings. Squire Woodbridge organized with a dozen visiting militiamen to capture Captain Hamlin. Perez found out their plan and instead surprised the squire and the militiamen with his own group of men, while the militia were still sleeping.

The Stockbridge crowds were overjoyed with the prospects of seeing the squire punished.

"Perez is going to whip them!" they cried.

"Ha, Perez. That's what they'd do to you. They're going to be whipped!" they cried. "Bring them out! Bring out the silk stockings!"

Perez made up his mind that there'd be no whipping; there'd be no treat for the drunken and excited crowd. With a pistol in each hand, he ordered the crowd to stand back. "If anyone tries to enter my headquarters, which is George Fennell's house, I'll shoot." The men in here are my prisoners."

Ezra stood by him. "You don't need those shooters," he said. "I'll break their necks as they come on."

The demonstration ended. The Squire was forever indebted to Perez, and he hated him for it.

The village, however, was in a state of turmoil. With the capture of the militiamen, Perez's rebels acquired an extra store of gunpowder and muskets. Stockbridge heard that Captain Shays's forces had stopped the court at Springfield and, finding no jail to empty, began to loot the homes. Perez doubled his guard in order to protect the entire village from outside looters.

Ezra was in favor of having Berkshire County join Vermont, where there were fewer troubles.

The Boston people thought otherwise. Contributing money from their

own fortunes, citizens loyal to the government recommended that 4,000 militia under the leadership of General Lincoln march into the disaffected counties and put down the rebellion.

With the thought of open conflict--for there had been no bloodshed up to this time--the people took off their hemlock sprigs. "We owe it to our wives and children not to get involved," they told Perez. He agreed with them. But they didn't wear the white of the government party, either. Indeed, many threw down their arms when the militia re-entered Stockbridge at the end of January. They were not cowards, but they didn't have the courage to shoot a neighbor or to go against the law.

Most of the Stockbridge people obediently submitted to the oath of allegiance to the state.

Perez, Ezra, and a few others escaped over the border into New York. Perez realized that, as a leader, his penalties might be severe and that in reality the legislature would not allow the known insurgents to get off so easily. This was true. The former insurgents could not sit on a jury for three years; nor could they vote on any issue for an entire year. Perez felt that control was back in the hands of the silk stockings.

At the end of February, a restless Perez Hamlin, with a group of 130 men, left New Lebanon, New York, for Pittsfield. General Lincoln's army was looking for them. Five miles from the New York border on the main road

leading into Sheffield, Perez's men walked into an ambush.

"The Shaysites are coming."

The Colonel gave the order to fire. Not a man obeyed. "We can't kill our friends," they said.

"I say pour on your fire."

It was one of the few occasions when the insurgents stood their ground against superior equipment and trained men. For ten minutes, gunfire was exchanged. When the smoke cleared, Perez Hamlin lay critically wounded on the bloodstained snow.

The government pardoned Shays, who had fled into Vermont. If he had lived, it is likely that Perez would have been pardoned. He would have seen the laws changed to help the debtors, although the wagonload of specially printed money never arrived at Stockbridge. Perez would have observed that this lesson of disunity contributed to the unification of the nation and to the ratification of the Federal Constitution.

PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE: PART II

"You have a right to question me because I wear fine clothes and my hands are clean," the tall, blond-haired man said. He was standing at the bar of a saloon in the tough Five Point section of New York City. His diamond studs sparkled. "I'm not one of those Park Avenue swells with $300 to buy my way out of the draft," he continued.

"That's just malarkey. You going to tell us you've worked on the docks, I suppose," a longshoreman cried.

"Yes, I have! As a young man I worked ten hours a day on the docks. But I studied and pulled myself up the ladder. My heart's with you and always will be!"

"What are you telling us?" a drunken voice drawled.

"I can't stand by and watch that man in the White House take away your birthright as a free-born American!" The blond-haired man pounded on the bar. "It's not a war to save your homes. It's a war for evil purposes. It's a war against white Southerners, a war to free the nigger!" He paused. "Is that what you want? To spill your blood so that niggers can be free?"

"No! No!" the listeners shouted.

The blond-haired man looked about the barroom and spotted a young man who wore the army cap of the Fifth Corps and a torn blue tunic. He pointed at him. "Here's a fellow who'll tell you what war's like!"

"Yes, I've seen it. I'm still carrying a Reb minie ball I got at Antietam."

The young man tapped his left leg. "And my friends got worse. And for what? To free the niggers. They said to preserve the union. That's just rot. For war profit, more likely, and to free the nigger. And they'll draft you to do the same."

"What can we do about it?" one man growled.

"Aren't you prepared to fight for your rights? You can smash this draft business," the blond-haired man replied.

"How?"

"Organize! Strike a blow for liberty. Don't show up at the docks for work tomorrow. Let's all meet at seven at the entrance of Central Park at Sixth Avenue and plan to stop the draft drawing. I'll be there myself!"

"Yes, yes," the men shouted enthusiastically, pounding their beer mugs on the bar.

The blond-haired man moved near the door, turned, and went out. A minute later the young man from the Army Fifth Corps joined him in a nearby alley.

"You were great, Thomas James," the young army man said. "You have them eating out of your hands."

"So were you, Lewis" James said. "But don't overdo the Antietam business. I knew courageous men who died there!" He was defensive and somewhat scared.

"O.K., O.K. I suppose it's hard to forget when you're a union deserter turned Copperhead," Lewis said.

"Lay off, Lewis. This is a contract. I'll do the job. Don't worry." In retaliation, he said, "It isn't honorable either for a Southern gentleman to wear the disguise of a Union soldier. Especially while carrying Confederate identification papers." The score was even.

"Oh, damn! Come on! There're more saloons to tap in this lousy rat trap district," Lewis said.

The two men went off to plant the seeds of hatred and dissatisfaction.

They had succeeded in inciting the longshoremen and other workmen to riot. The next day, the corrupt pier bosses found the usually overflowing daily work lines thin, at least empty of white longshoremen. Tension had existed among the workmen on the waterfront over the last months; fighting had occurred among rival gangs trying to compete for rich contracts.

The malicious bosses would hire unemployed Negroes in order to break strikes or in order to keep the white dockmen "in line," with the constant reminder that striking usually got them nowhere. And the bosses cut the workers' pay when they were the cause of damages and accidents on the docks.

On this Monday in July, only a week after the Union victory at Gettysburg, the bosses found there were more Negroes than whites waiting to be hired, and they were not pleased. The Negroes were immediately set on by those white longshoremen who had not gone to Central Park, and the Negro longshoremen fled from the hiring lines. For those few whites, they were masters of the waterfront for the day.

James and Lewis had little trouble guiding the mob who carried signs bearing the words "NO DRAFT." The crowd moved along the streets stopping streetcars and frightening passengers; and, occasionally, Lewis's men shinnied up telegraph poles and cut wires. When the crowd arrived at the office of the United States Marshal they thought the draft call had been canceled.

"We licked them," they cried. "They're not going to draw." The remark was premature.

"No one's going to stop me from carrying out my duty," the Marshal said to his assistant. He signaled his assistant to open the office.

The policeman on guard were barely able to hold the shouting crowd as they rushed into the office. A loud voice cried out: "Spin that wheel, and you're a dead man, you Lincoln lover." Many of the men carried iron crowbars; those under Lewis's command held axes.

The Marshal calmly announced: "In accordance with the National Conscription Law of March, 1863, the draft for this district of New York City will begin." He then blindfolded the clerk and cranked the wheel to make the barrel, filled with slips of paper, spin in preparation for the first draw.

From the rear of the crowd, a hate-filled voice cried out, "Don't let them get away with this!" A whiskey bottle whizzed by the Marshal's head and smashed on the wall. Someone on the street fired a revolver; the bullet hit a horse, and it died in convulsions. In the office, someone jumped through the police line and smashed the draft wheel with a crowbar. One of Lewis's men

threw a glass jar at the wall. The jar exploded, and a sickening sulphur odor filled the room.

"Let's get out of here. We'll all burn alive," someone shrieked. They stumbled and ran and rushed toward the only exit. The policemen defended themselves with their night sticks; they were carried along with the rioters into the street. The inevitable happened. A woman was trampled to death by the rioters on the stairway, and the sight of this woman incited the mob to more destruction.

With a little encouragement from James, the rioters, often drunk and sometimes accompanied by their wives, continued on a disorderly path of destruction. All normal commerce stopped in the city for the next four days. Frightened citizens barred doors and windows and stayed inside.

James stood in front of a crowd of upturned faces. "You've done a good job," he said. Toward Lexington Avenue, he saw columns of black smoke and fire.

"You've struck a blow for liberty, men," he continued. "Yes, get together and smash this abolitionist draft into the dust."

They cheered, and he smiled confidently. "Perhaps," he thought, "I will be remembered in history." He addressed beer swillers and rum pots, thieves and "fence men." He knew how to handle this kind of crowd. And they knew the draft quota had been doubled as punishment for the rioting. They would not stop.

"For the work ahead, we need weapons. We need a gun for every man.

I'll lead you to them. On to the arsenal, men!" he said, and waved the rioters on.

They were, however, unsuccessful at storming the arsenal. There were street blockades. There were miles of torn tracks of the Harlem railroad; there was a fire at the Bull's Head Hotel.

And there was the Colored Orphan Asylum on Forty-third Street and Fifth Avenue. It was a large property, with lawn and shade trees. The orphanage was an object of pride among New York charities. Three hundred children were being cared for here when a group of rioters, on that same Monday afternoon, suddenly came upon the white doctor who was in charge of the orphanage.

"We've come to clean out the nigger children," bawled a drunk.

"Certainly you don't want the blood of children on your hands," the doctor pleaded. "Let me take the children out, and you can take over the building, if this is what you want."

The ring leader of the mob agreed.

The doctor didn't waste time. He quickly marched the wide-eyed and frightened children out onto the street. The mob charged into the orphanage, deliberately set on destroying it. They carried out bedding, beds, curtains, furniture, kitchen utensils, and even toys. Then they set the place on fire.

Once outside, they turned their wrath against the children. The doctor had placed them behind a fire wagon which had rushed to meet the alarm. The firemen were protecting the children with the fire hose nozzles trained on the mob.

Instead of putting out the fire, which at that moment was unimportant, the firemen threatened to turn the hose on the rioters.

As the rioters came closer to the orphans, shouting "Kill them," the firemen gave them a last warning to "Stay where you are or else."

"O.K.," the ring leader finally cried. "You can keep your pickaninnies, you nigger lover." The ring leader turned to the rioters. "Come on. Let's go elsewhere. Let's go to Fifth Avenue, where the rich ones are. Let's burn out the Mayor."

They set out to burn out the rich ones. On the way, a good many rioters had additional ideas. They wanted to settle a score with Horace Greeley, who was the editor of The Tribune. The Tribune had a wide circulation, and Greeley's editorial support of the Republican party and of President Lincoln had alienated the majority of the immigrant laborers. The staff of The Tribune were determined to continue publication of the newspaper, and they defended themselves behind locked doors with loaded pistols provided by the police. With pistols on their desks, the men continued operating the presses. The mob succeeded only in gutting a side of the building.

It was difficult to determine what motivated the specific violent, murderous actions of the rioters. For men such as Mulahley and Dugan, hatred for the rich came naturally. Both were Irish immigrants, nourished on maggot-filled potatoes and skim milk, working in an iron foundry for a dollar a day. Both had developed hatred through their own misery and fear. Both felt that they hated

Negroes, although neither really had met or knew any. All the men in the iron foundry hated Negroes; so Mulahley and Dugan agreed to hate.

Many of the foundry workers did not report to work on Tuesday. By mid-morning, Dugan and Mulahley, demonstrating with the rioters against the draft, found themselves suddenly staring drunkenly into Brooks Brothers' window.

"There's clothing in there for all of us!" someone yelled.

A brick flew through the show window, and the men scrambled into the store. Dugan and Mulahley were among those who got inside. The ground floor was filled with laughing, shrieking men and women. They tugged at clothing and tore it. They tossed silk ties, shirts, and socks into the air. They dragged suits out by the armful. They threw underwear all over the floor, and bolts of material were strewn over the counters. Dugan made his way past the mobs and onto the balcony where the hats were displayed. He stared at the rows of hat. fixed on wooden shaping blocks and finally reached out to touch one. The velour was softer than he had ever imagined it would be. He picked up the velour and tried it on.

"The coppers are coming," someone warned. The looters tried to escape. Some managed to get away with their loot. Others were stopped by the night sticks of the policemen, who quickly closed in on the rioters.

Dugan was still wearing the velour hat -- a bit bloodied from the police-man's blows -- when the wagon came to pick him up. Mulahley had jumped out of a balcony window in a panic. When the police took his body to the morgue,

they found he had put on four shirts, a suit, and a pair of fine suede shoes.

The violence of the rampaging mobs continued and spread to the Harlem and Yorkville suburbs. Atrocities against the Negro communities continued. Thomas Acton, commander of the Metropolitan police, asked that all precinct stations shelter as many Negroes as possible. The mobs then attempted to burn down the precinct stations.

The young Negroes offered their help. "You can help us help ourselves. We can fight. Give us revolvers. Give us a chance for our lives."

The precinct captains in the Negro districts knew these youths were hard-working and law-abiding. The blacks had already fought well on the battlefield against the Rebels; they could fight in New York.

"I'll swear in any man as temporary deputy to defend public property," said Commissioner Acton. The mob did not burn down the precinct station because the mob knew the Negroes would die fighting and would take many with them. The captain's decision was a just one, but the destruction and violence of the mob was not stopped.

On Wednesday, two Negroes who had done nothing were caught and lynched. Because the police were understaffed, they were unable effectively to control the violence of the mob.

Governor Horatio Seymour was unable to convince the mob, gathered to hear his speech, that he would look into the draft problem. It was no time for persuasion. The Mayor of the city simply requested that neighborhoods organize

voluntary associations under competent leaders to patrol and protect the neighborhoods. Help in restoring order to New York came in a communication from Edwin Stanton, President Lincoln's Secretary of War. Five regiments, with artillery, just released after Gettysburg, were on the way. The New York State Militia also fighting in Pennsylvania were on the way. Governor Seymour had concluded that force was the only way to meet force.

Among the militia was an all-Irish unit. They resented having to put down the rioting so soon after fighting in battle. All units were carefully disciplined. They grumbled about the heat, but the columns moved off from the ferries and steadily uptown and into the riot areas as they sang "John Brown's body lies a-moldering in the grave."

The resistance of the rioters subsided by Friday, once the command was given, "Number one round of grapeshot. Fire at will!" The shells smashed through the barricades; bricks from the chimneys fell into the pavements. Slashing bayonets met with clubs and knives. Bodies lay along the sidewalks. Women encouraged children to strip clothing and valuables from the untended bodies. The last of the rioters took to the marshlands or river bed or hid in coalbins or attics until order was restored. A thousand men -- rioters, Negroes, innocent bystanders, police, and infantry -- had been killed during that one week in July. Property damage was estimated at a million and a half dollars. The arsenal had been set afire during the attack on it, and scores of rioters were killed. Fifty bushels of bones were removed from the rubbish in the arsenal attack and buried in Potter's Field.

Squads of police sent into the shanties of the Five Point district repossessed loot from the cellars: the costly stolen furniture, clothes, fine laces, and glassware. Pawnshops were investigated; most personal property was identified and returned.

Lewis's body was at the bottom of the East River. He had been killed while leading a frantic attack on the Union Steam Works, where guns were stored. This arsenal had been his objective from the beginning. The men under his command took his body and removed all identification papers and a gold watch. James, who had run away from the fight at the Steam Works, was later arrested and charged with treason, arson, and inciting to riot.

On Friday morning, the longshoremen quietly stood in line on the docks. The factory and steel workers crowded near the locked gates eager to get in to work. Uptown, the surveyors were planning to rebuild the Marshal's office.

PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE: PART III

My name is Rudolph Schnauboldt. I threw the bomb which killed one policeman and wounded sixty policemen in Chicago in 1886. I am now dying of tuberculosis in my German homeland and have read in a week-old copy of the New York Tribune about the suicide of my young friend, Louis Lingg.

The account says that Lingg died hard. I knew that he would die hard and would never complain about the pain he must have suffered for six hours. I knew Lingg would use an explosive; but a fulminate cap placed in his mouth was not a quick way to die. I can see the blood, flesh, and bits of teeth and bone splattered about the cell. I can see the mouth and jaw blown away from the once-handsome face, the trimmed black beard, and steel-gray eyes.

Unlike the four others condemned to die for the bomb-throwing -- August Spies, Albert Parsons, George Engel, and Adolph Fischer, all of whom I had met -- I knew that Lingg would cheat the hangman. He was a born anarchist and always believed in violence.

If I had not left Chicago more than a year ago, immediately after I threw the bomb, I, too, would have been condemned to death. I say "too," making the ninth person on trial, because the police and factory owners, as far as I am concerned, were determined to condemn all known anarchists.

But I must help you to understand Lingg and the others and how I became involved in the Chicago riot.

I went to Chicago to work as a writer on a German socialist workingman's newspaper, Arbeiter Zeitung. I had a letter of introduction to August Spies, the editor of the paper.

We became friends very quickly. Spies was very persuasive and knew the circumstances of the foreign workers better than anyone else.

"Whether they come from Norway or Germany or anywhere, they are cheated for three years by everyone. I'd like to start a labor bureau to help them. We have people in need all the time. Recently a man died from breathing nitrous acid fumes from a broken fan in a jewelry factory. He leaves a wife and three children," Spies said.

"Do these industrial accidents happen often?" I asked.

"Yes," he said. "Countless times. Many women are getting 'wrist-drop,' that's paralysis of the wrist."

"From what?" I asked.

"Lead poisoning in the paint factories," he replied. "And married couples often have no children as a result. And there's what is known as phosphorus jaw in the match factory. The teeth decay and fall out from the phosphorus fumes."

"How awful!" I exclaimed.

He nodded. Then he said, "Of course, you'll want to come to our socialist meeting. You are a socialist?"

"I don't know that I'm a socialist," I replied. "But my sympathies are with the workingman. I'd like to come to your meeting."

I decided to write a series of articles on workingmen's clubs from my observations in their meetings. I soon learned that permanent injuries, such as blindness, were frequently caused by explosions in industrial plants through carelessness and negligence. With no insurance compensation, the workmen

turned to these clubs for help. They received the help they needed; other workmen dug into their half-empty pockets for donations.

In this way, I met Albert Parsons at one of these meetings. Parsons was an editor of an English-language labor paper called The Alarm. He was a dynamic speaker, and he held spellbound the large crowds which he addressed.

"Think of the injustice of it all!" he cried. "We men are gradually winning a mastery over nature. The newest force, electricity, is also the cheapest and most efficient. Yet the poor in Chicago will not have the benefit of it. You workmen make the carriages, while the rich drive in them; you trap the animals so the rich can have furs. We will die while the rich get richer. But I refuse to believe it. I have another vision."

His appeal was effective as he proceeded to sketch a workingman's paradise.

I learned that Parsons was speaking for the Labor Party, which hoped to get the legislature to pass an Eight Hour Bill. In the age of machinery, an eight-hour day, he said, could accomplish as much as a hundred hours before. The shorter work day (reduced from ten to eight hours) would give the workman the possibility of a more human existence. What confused me about Parson's speaking was the way in which he used the words socialist and anarchist to mean the same thing. In Europe, anarchist mean revolutionist.

I had drawn a little away from the crowd and was thinking about getting home to write my story when I heard the tramping of feet and saw about a hundred policemen marching down the street. Inspector Benfield, who was identified

for me and who later led the police against the strikers, shouted, "Break it up; break it up."

Parsons insisted, "We are not interfering with anybody. We are harming nobody." All of a sudden, Bonfield struck with his club. In a moment, the police were pulled down by the crowd. The rest of the police had to use their clubs, and the crowd began to ravel away at the edges. My blood was boiling; I had no weapon and could do nothing. A policeman came at me with a raised club. I winced, but felt nothing. When I opened my eyes, I discovered the policeman on the ground. A man with a black beard and steel-gray eyes ran from me. I did not know him then, but I had seen Louis Lingg for the first time.

I wrote my first account of a police attack as I had seen it, but no paper wanted to print it. Although the newspapers did not object to the meetings, they were against the eight-hour day.

Soon after, I was introduced to another writer who claimed that the socialist newspaper I worked for was "nothing important." "The revolutionary force in Chicago is the 'Lehr und Wehr Verein'". I had never heard of it.

"Come with me tonight. I'll show you," said the writer. "These boys are anarchists. They won't let themselves be clubbed to death."

The word seemed terrible to me. "Are there really anarchists in Chicago?" I wondered privately.

When we arrived at the meeting, the man who had probably saved my life, Louis Lingg, was speaking.

"One can't meet bludgeons with words, nor blows by turning the other cheek. Violence must be met with violence. Americans should know," he continued calmly, "that action and reaction are equal and opposite; oppression and revolt equal and opposite, also."

Parsons had a gift for speech, but Lingg's insight was remarkable, and I could not help agreeing with him. We were introduced. "I have read some of your work, and I like it," he said. "There's sincerity in it." I wanted to mention that he had saved me from a policeman's club, but didn't. We exchanged addresses, and he invited me to visit with him.

During the long, cold winter when the Great Lakes froze over, I spent many hours with Lingg discussing anarchism, capitalism, and the problems of the workingman.

As spring came, Spies and Parsons revived the agitation for the eight-hour day and together set about organizing a big demonstration for the first of May. The foreign population was greatly encouraged. At this time, there were many small strikes, with a large strike going on at the factory of the McCormick Harvester and Reaper works. The workers were trying to unionize the plant.

On one side of the McCormick works was a section of the city occupied by the German, Polish, and Bohemian workers. Spies, through his newspaper, called a meeting for the strikers on the afternoon of May third in an open field near this section.

Twelve thousand workers stretched themselves out on the grass that

afternoon. Some were from the furniture factories; some from the planning mills. There were railroad workers, gas company employees, iron mill workers, meat packers, and plumbers. Nearly all were foreigners, and they wore bits of red ribbon on the lapels of their coats.

Spies jumped onto an empty freight car in the field and addressed the crowd. He shouted in German, "Let every man stand shoulder to shoulder, and we will win this fight. Drive the 'scabs' out of the yards, and let us show McCormick that he can not hire non-union men while we are forced to have our children crying for bread."

"Off to McCormick's!" was the cry. They rushed down the car tracks and swept over the vacant lots.

"Kill the scabs!" Someone hurled a boulder through one of the windows.

"Tear down the building," shouted another, seeing a pale face near the window inside. All the windows on the three-story building were broken. Not one escaped the fury of the crowd.

They were about to storm the gate into the main yard when a police wagon with twelve armed policemen arrived on the scene. They ordered the crowd to disperse. As the crowd rushed toward them, the officers fired. Many of the strikers fled. Six were killed outright, and several others were wounded. Police reinforcements arrived. They formed lines twelve abreast and marched forward with revolver barrels held on a level with their heads. The remaining crowd dispersed.

Although the McCormick works was cleared, the strikers lined Blue

Island Avenue from the factory to heckle the scabs. The police escorted the scabs to their homes, and along the route women and children threw stones and bricks from windows, causing many injuries.

I had been with the strikers in the attack on the McCormick works. Lingg had arrived late.

"What do you think of it? Terrible, wasn't it?" I said.

"It's the parting of the ways," he said.

"What do you mean?" I asked. "What do you intend to do?"

"Revolt," he replied instantly.

"Then count me in, too," I said in wild indignation.

"You'd better think it over," he warned.

"I have done all the thinking necessary."

He looked at me and then said, "I wonder about the meeting tomorrow in the Haymarket. Will the police try to disperse that?"

I had quite forgotten about the Haymarket demonstration meeting. Then we planned what we would do at the meeting.

I took courage from what he said. He asked me whether I had enough money to travel. I said I had saved $1,000.

"If a bomb is thrown, the police will arrest hundreds. I want to go into their courtroom and stand up and say, 'You have pronounced a sentence on society; I am innocent,'" he said.

We planned to meet later in the evening, and then I left for home for needed rest.

Spies had placed a large announcement in that afternoon's edition of the Arbeiter Zeitung:

Attention Workingmen

Great Mass Meeting Tonight at 7:30

Haymarket, Randolph Street. Bet. Desplaines & Halstead

Good Speakers will be present to denounce the latest atrocious act of the police shooting of our fellow workmen yesterday afternoon.

The Executive Committee.

Before we started out for the meeting, Lingg made me promise that I would escape and not give myself up. I made the promise. I had packed and was ready.

"Have you the bomb?"

"Here it is." Lingg took it out of his coat pocket. He always wore a double-breasted coat. The bomb was no larger than an orange.

"It has a double action," he said. "If you pull the tape, it will set fire to something inside. Wait five seconds before you throw."

"Shall I throw it in any case?" I asked.

"Only if the police interfere. And remember to throw yourself down on your hands and knees."

The speaker's stand was a truck wagon, placed where a blind alley intersected the street. We were at the rear of the building occupied by the Crane Brothers' elevator factory. Three thousand strikers had already gathered there.

Spies had finished speaking as we came up.

He was saying, "It is said that I inspired the attack on McCormick's. That is a lie. McCormick is the man who created the row, and he must be held responsible for the murder of his brothers.

The crowd cried, "Hang him!"

Parsons was next to speak: "It is time to raise a note of warning. There is nothing in the eight-hour movement to excite the capitalists. Whenever you make a demand for an increase in pay, the Pinkerton men are called out, and you are shot and clubbed in the street. In your interest, you must arm yourself."

They cried, "We will, we will."

I heard Mayor Harrison remark, "Parsons is a little incendiary -- a real demagogue -- but I bet he can make a good political speech." The Mayor had come to look the meeting over, and his presence kept the crowds in line.

The flames of the gas lights flickered as a few drops of rain fell. A storm was coming, and a few in the crowd drifted away.

I saw the Mayor and other city officials leave. I could hear my heart beating and hoped that everything would pass over in peace. But suddenly I saw the flicker of a hundred stars and a thousand brass buttons turning the corner. I noticed Inspector Bonfield in the lead, marching his men in platoon fashion, choking the street gutter to gutter. As the platoon crossed the car tracks, they clutched their clubs firmly. The Inspector asked the help of Parsons and Spies to disperse the crowd. As they came down from the wagon, the crowd broke. All means of escape were blocked, however. The clubs fell upon the crowd as they ran along the sidewalk.

I made up my mind. I put my hand in my trouser pocket, drew the tape, and began to count. I took the bomb out of my pocket and looked for a place to throw it.

My ears were split with the roar. The burst of flame lit up the street. I finally scrambled to my feet. I did not dare to look; the groans and shrieks were enough for me. My senses left me. I was sick.

I felt Lingg thrust his arm into mine and say, "Come on, man, this way. Don't look. Hold yourself up."

"I cannot walk," I gasped. "I must stop."

"Nonsense," he said. "Don't break down." He gave me a flask of brandy and made me empty it.

Lingg saw me to the railroad depot. I managed to bluff my way by the police guard, by the ticket collectors, and boarded a train for New York.

"We did right, didn't we?" I asked weakly. I wondered how many strikers had been hit, for I knew there would be a battle.

"Yes, Rudolph. Have no doubt. I'm going to tread the same path. Think of the workmen they shot, and you'll be all right."

We said good-by. And I was left alone.

The attitude of the accused served as a contrast to my own cowardice. In London, I read that not a single man accused of the bomb throwing turned state's evidence or tried to lay the blame for his position on anybody else. Nor did anyone attempt to deny the beliefs that he held.

In my mind, I felt the prisoners accused were superior to anyone else.

The police had been unable to find Parsons after the explosion. He declared in a press letter that he was innocent, and, therefore, he would give himself up and be tried with the others. Parsons quietly took a train back to Chicago.

Parson's surrender caused a certain sympathy toward the accused prisoners. If Parsons was not guilty, none of the eight could be found guilty and convicted. Yet the bomb had been thrown, and someone must be punished for throwing it. Of course, with eight men accused, it meant that I would not be sought.

Then I read that the police had discovered bombs in Parson's desk and rifles in Spies's house, and I did not bother to read further. The papers carried pictures of the bombs, which were not like the one I threw and the one which Lingg had made.

Everyone wanted to condemn the foreign anarchists as a body and not to exite more sympathy for them by forcing Parsons to share their fate. The officials involved tried to have Parsons sign a petition asking for mercy. Parsons refused to sign. "It would be a betrayal and would seal the fate of my comrades. I would rather be hanged a thousand times," he said.

Lingg had his day in court, as I had promised he would have. I had not admitted to my part of the riot. The closing words of his defense were typical.

"I am on trial because I am an anarchist. I repeat," he thundered," that I am the enemy of the order of today, and I repeat that, so long as breath remains in me, I shall combat it. I declare again, I am in favor of force. I despise you, your order, your laws, and your authority. Hang me for it."

I have doubts about many things I have done. But I'm certain of one thing; they were all great men, because they believed in a better future for the workingman. I know I will be despised by those in power and judged guilty by all who were injured in the struggle.

Viewed from this distance, if I really had it to do over again, I might have second thoughts. I just can't get out of my head the shrieks of the injured, including the workingmen.

PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE: PART IV

Eugene Debs was resting in his room in a Chicago hotel when there was a knock. A man with a tall, lean frame, he had to stoop to open the door.

"Are you Mr. Debs?" the caller asked.

Debs nodded.

"I'm Marshal Arnold of Judge Grosscup's Federal court. I have a warrant for your arrest. Please come with me immediately."

Eugene Deb's brother, Theodore, came into the room. Silently he helped his brother on with his suit coat. They walked out of the hotel with the Marshal behind them. In a few minutes they were in the Federal Building, along with several American Railway Union officials.

"Mr. Debs, the judge says I'll have to lock you up," the Marshal said.

Eugene Debs was locked up, too late to receive any supper. He sat on the hard cot that was fastened to the cement wall and put his face in his hands. How could he begin to explain to his wife, Kate, that all this was a necessary and unavoidable part of the struggle to which he was dedicated, that his arrest was part of the job? Everything, he felt, had gone to nothing: his years of labor on the railroads, his efforts in organizing the local Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen at Terre Haute, his efforts in organizing his own labor organization -- the American Railway Union, only a couple of years ago -- everything, including his beliefs.

His flesh crawled as he heard rats scratching on the cement, and he

perspired in the humid July day. At that moment, he heard voices and footsteps in the corridor. The guard unlocked the door, and a visitor entered the cell. The door clanged shut behind him.

"It's me, Gene, Clarence Darrow. I just got word of your arrest."

The two men shook hands in the dark. "It's after hours. How did you get in?" Debs asked.

Darrow grinned. "They still think I'm working for the Chicago and Northwestern Railway."

"You are, aren't you?"

"No. I gave up my job this afternoon. I don't care for the General Managers' Association. These railroad managers who joined the Association have done all they can to prevent the workers from expressing their viewpoint. I told my company president I wanted to defend Eugene Debs and the American Railway Union."

Deb's face brightened. "And what did the president say?"

"Oh, he said, 'You haven't a chance.' He said, 'You were told by the court order to stop the strike," and you didn't.' He said, 'I'm going to defend a hopeless cause because the court order is too powerful."

The guard leered through the barred door. "We'll take care of you the same way we did the Haymarket rioters nine years ago. I guarded Parsons and Spies in this same cell block."

Debs felt sick as he asked Darrow to confirm this information. He was uneasy even in the presence of Darrow and his promise for a good defense.

"Why did the guard say that? I haven't killed anybody," Debs said.

"Neither did they," Darrow answered. He put his arm around Debs to comfort and reassure him. "They had a public trial, and so will you. Don't worry, Gene."

"I suppose I deserve to be in this cell," Debs said.

"What?"

"I condemned the Haymarket demonstration. I believed the demonstrators were all guilty. I wrote articles against them in my Locomotive Fireman's Magazine. I thought they ruined the chances of workingmen to organize and fight for the eight-hour day."

Clarence Darrow left, and Debs sat back on his cot. His mind wandered back to that warm May day when the men who represented the workers at the Pullman Palace Car company had come from Chicago to talk with him. He knew they were troubled, and he asked them what was on their minds.

"The men at the Pullman shops where we've been repairing the cars are going on strike -- all 4,000 workers want to quit work," one of the men said.

"What's the problem?" Debs asked.

"Our wages have been cut up to 70% over the last year. We owe for back rents," another man said.

"Wages have dropped all around this year. But I can see where there wouldn't be much demand for fancy Pullman cars," Debs volunteered.

"Mr. Pullman still makes a big profit on the rental of the cars to the railroads. But our immediate complaint is this: a couple of days ago, a

committee of workers discussed our problems with Mr. Pullman, and he assured us that none of the committee would be discriminated against. But three of the men were fired after they met with him," the first speaker explained.

"We feel the company managers will continue to fire men representing all our workers whenever they make a complaint."

Another man continued: "Then the company made out a written statement before the United States Strike Commission testifying they had laid off the workers because of 'lack of work.' This time the statement just isn't true. Gene, we want the American Railway Union workers to refuse to haul Pullman cars."

- "Wait a minute, boys. You all belong to the American Railway Union, but none of your Pullman workers is a railway man. You build and repair palace cars. You're talking about a sympathy strike. You want the engineers and switchmen to quit work to show the company they agree with your actions. It's never been done before."

"No. Neither had there ever been a labor organization including all the workmen in the yards and on the tracks before. But that didn't stop you from forming the American Railway Union, Gene!"

Debs was impressed, but he proceeded cautiously.

"We are a new organization. You have a 4,000 membership," Debs replied. "We have to make certain that the remaining 150,000 members in the Midwest are loyal before we attempt a nationwide sympathy strike."

"In other words, you want ideal conditions before you can help us!" The speaker's face was red. "We have to strike when the time is right.

Didn't you learn that when you won out on James Hill and the Great Northern Railroad?"

The year before, after an 18-day standstill, James Hill had given in to demands from the American Railway Union not to reduce wages.

"O.K. We'll give you all the help we can. But you have to promise that you'll try to settle your differences first as soon as you go back to Chicago. Call in another group to listen to your complaints. Ask the Mayor to represent you with the company. This is the most promising means for action. Our numbers are the only real weapons against the companies. But remember they are also organized in a group to fight you. And they have billions of dollars behind them. We don't."

"We'll try anything," one of the men said. "Will you promise to come to Chicago and go through the town of Pullman with us?"

"Yes," Debs answered.

Before he went to Chicago, Debs learned that work at the Pullman Palace Car Company, which manufactured refrigerator and elevator cars also, had become scarce and that George Pullman had taken repair contracts at a loss to the company of $50,000 in order to keep the shops open and to undercut his competitors. The Pullman Company had made a profit of five and a half million dollars the year before, but George Pullman was determined that the $50,000 operating loss should be absorbed by the workers. He had cut the workers' wages by 25% at least during the previous year. In many instances, the men's wages were just enough to cover the amount for their weekly rent. He had made

five reductions in their wages, but rents had not been lowered.

When Debs arrived at the union headquarters in Chicago a week later, the Pullman workers had quit work. He learned from his friends that Mr. Pullman would not restore wages.

"Mr. Pullman said there is nothing to settle or to think over," one union man reported.

Another man claimed," The United States Strike Commission confronted Mr. Pullman with the chart of his profits. Mr. Pullman claimed that he had to show profits in order to satisfy the people who have invested in the company."

Still another man reminded Debs of his promise. "You're coming out to Pullman with us."

The pamphlets described the 600-acre town as "perfectly equipped, a beautiful and harmonious whole". Debs discovered that the buildings were of the cheapest construction, with small and dark room and with one faucet in the basement. Four or five families lived in each house. The very streets were Pullman's.

The men explained, "We can't get a job in the Pullman shops unless we rent one of these houses; we could rent in Roseland for half the price. And all the expenses for repairs are taken out of our wages before we receive them."

Debs figured there was more than 100% profit on the housing, and he disliked what he saw. He also knew there was no use in trying to compromise the workers' differences. The year-long wage cuts and the recent firing of the

committee workers were the causes for their men's quitting their jobs. One complaint the railway workers had in common with the Pullman workers was general wage cuts. But he would not commit the railway workers to a sympathy strike without their voting on it themselves. The final decision to make this complaint common to all rested with the membership.

After a fruitless attempt at reaching an agreement with the Pullman Company, the American Railway Union, with the approval of the local unions, voted to quit their jobs unless the Pullman Palace Car Company adjusted the wages of the workers before June 26, 1894.

Debs stated that "the members of the American Railway Union will refuse to handle Pullman cars and equipment after that date." By refusing to handle Pullman cars, the workers would cut off the chief source of the Pullman company's earnings and might force the company to reach an agreement with its employees who had quit their jobs. This procedure Debs referred to as "boycott." He hoped that the railroad management would allow the Pullman cars to be detached from the rest of a train and left at the railroad siding. Otherwise, all the employees, including the conductors, would go off their jobs, and by that action most of the nation's railroads would be drawn into the conflict.

Debs maintained, "The men are willing to continue work for the railroads as long as the Pullman cars are not attached to the trains. Clearly, their action is a sympathetic one."

In a few days, all lines operating west of Chicago were at a standstill,

because the railway owners, according to plan, fired the switchmen who refused to handle Pullman cars. Thus the idea of the boycott -- to segregate the Pullman cars from the train -- never went into effect as it had been intended by the American Railway workers. The numbers involved in the walkout from jobs drew the attention of the whole country to the conflict.

Samuel Gompers came to Chicago to give Debs a check from the American Federation of Labor. Gompers, who was president of the American Federation of Labor, had himself organized many trades into one group and had won favors from employers through their friendship. He was convinced, however, that the American Railway Union would lose its fight; and, therefore, he decided against a general strike in sympathy.

An attempt to make peace was tried. The officials of the Union offered to call off the strike if all the workers were rehired. The railway managers would not agree. For several days after the June 26th deadline, Debs and his brother, Theodore, kept in touch with all the stations which had been closed down. Some 27 states were involved. The men had gone home and had stayed at home. Debs was encouraged.

But Theodore cautioned that the headlines pointed an accusing finger at Debs: NATION PARALYZED BY DEBS STRIKE. "It seems," he said, "that the General Managers' Association is writing the story for the papers." This organization consisted of 24 railroad owners whose lines began or terminated in Chicago, and they did all they could to crush the strike. "Some people are asking the Governor to send out the militia," Theodore continued.

"But we're peaceable!" Debs insisted. "The state militia can only be sent out at the request of local officials when riot conditions are out of control! Governor Altgeld assured me the strikers would be all right if they merely refused to move Pullmans. The only thing that can defeat the strike now is violence."

Soon after this conversation with Theodore, Debs awoke on the morning of the fourth of July to find Federal troops in Chicago. They had been sent in by President Cleveland, and the Attorney General of the United States against the wishes of the Governor who felt this action was unnecessary. "The railroads are not obstructed," he wrote to President Cleveland. "We are not unwilling to enforce the law, but you insult the people of the state by implying that we cannot govern ourselves. The ordering out of Federal troops is unwarranted interference, and their presence proves to be an irritant."

As the days passed, Debs had confided to his friend, Clarence Darrow, who dropped by the union office, "I've told the men to stay home and stay sober and keep off railroad property."

"They're swearing in thousands of deputies," Darrow warned. "These deputies are the dregs of Chicago: the petty criminals. Tell your men to stay away from the deputies."

Darrow was right. The strikers were no match for the boyonets of the Federal troops and the newly sworn-in deputies. Troops and deputies lined the tracks. At the yards, the strikers there looked to Debs for his decision.

"What do we do now? Do we let the Federal troops move the trains?"

His word was swift. "Federal troops must not move the trains.

Spike the switches, but don't destroy railroad property."

It took the troops several hours to repair each switch within each block in order to move the trains. Then there were no more switches to spike or repair. The train could move out of the yard. While Debs watched and against his orders, his men overturned a freight car in the path of an outgoing train.

A riot call was sent out. The troops and deputies righted the freight cars as each was turned over. By nightfall, the train had moved six blocks. The workers felt that, since the freight cars had not been damaged, they were in the right.

Gene and Theodore Debs lay awake all night. The Managers Association had gone over the Governor's head by asking and receiving the aid of Federal troops. They meant to bring a train into Chicago over the Rock Island run in the morning. And in the morning, the Rock Island train was stopped by overturned freight cars in its path. This action complicated the issue, because it obstructed the movement of the mail trains as well. Any interference with the mails violated Federal laws. Throughout the strike, the mail trains were run whenever possible; but obstructing the tracks prevented the mails from moving.

This morning at Rock Island, a court order was read to the strikers to stop their actions under penalty of fine or imprisonment; but they did not seem to understand what it meant.

By evening, some freight cars were on fire. Strikers and deputies faced each other. The strikers charged; the militiamen fired, and three fell dead.

Debs was heartbroken. "Did I kill them?" he wondered, still sitting awake with his thoughts in prison. After Deb's arrest the strike was quickly broken. Those involved in the strike were put on employers' lists so that no company would rehire them. The American Railway Union was declared illegal, and its funds and records were seized. Debs and his officers were released on $10,000 bail. Debs went home to Terre Haute to assure his wife that no jury would ever send him to prison.

The trial was the next January, 1895.

"This is going to be the greatest opportunity labor has had to tell the American public its side of the story and to explain what the boycott was all about," Darrow claimed as they entered the courthouse. The publicity over the Pullman boycott had brought newsmen to report the trial from all over the country.

During the first week of the trial, the prosecution simply reconstructed the actions of the strikers. Debs commented to Darrow, "We don't deny the strikers spiked the switches and turned over the freight cars. Why does the prosecuting attorney recite what we don't even contest?"

"They must prove you deliberately tried to obstruct their public highways and that in calling the men off the job you planned to interfere with the normal transportation of United States mails," explained Darrow.

"But we offered to run the mail through on special trains."

"You don't have to convince me. Convince the jury."

The newspapers announced when Debs would take the stand in his own defense, so on that day the spectators jammed the courtroom. Family, students,

and professors watched while Debs was sworn in and listened intently to the details of his working career, of the suffering he had observed among the trainmen, and of the brutalizing effects of the 70-hour work week.

Slowly Darrow's questions to Debs revealed the circumstances of Deb's involvement in the labor movement: the need for safety and insurance benefits. How many times had he seen men's legs mangled by car wheels and faulty car couplings! And he often had to break the news of these accidents to their wives. Deb's defense was eloquent: he wasn't the dangerous character the Pullman Company had portrayed him as being.

The prosecuting attorney, however, stripped this defense of all of its human consideration and idealism. By way of his questions he made Debs admit that it had been a long time since he had worked with his hands, although "he called himself a friend of the railroader."

The prosecutor then began to question Debs about the finances of unions of which he had been secretary. The facts were that when Debs had started his American Railway Union, he earned $75.00 a month. At the time of the strike he earned $3,000. Debs never had bothered to keep an account of his traveling expenses or any spending he did for the union.

"Actually," the attorney said," there is very little control over what you do. There is no difference between your organization and what you do and the way a manager runs his railroad."

Darrow objected to this as being beside the point.

The prosecuting attorney questioned Debs about his home: its cost

and where the money had come from. Debs had to explain that the house was his wife's and that it was her money which had financed it. In fact, Mrs. Debs handled all the family business.

"Yes," the prosecuting attorney said," and you run your union as a business. You send your workers out to quit when it suits your purpose."

"We refuse to work only when conditions become unbearable and create hardships," Debs answered.

The attorney rested his argument on the idea that Debs was waging a class war against American industry and that he controlled the railroad workers for his own selfish advantage.

Clarence Darrow had the court issue a notice to George Pullman to appear in court as a witness, and he intended to have the members of the General Managers' Association "stand for their part in the conflict." Darrow wanted Pullman to explain the $26 million of undistributed profits in the company's treasury and the 8% interest return investors were receiving from the company.

But Pullman left town before the notice was officially given to him. One juror had been taken ill, so that the judge had to postpone the trial.

"I move that the defendants be discharged," said Darrow.

"Denied," Judge Grosscup said. And he dismissed the court, setting a future date for the trial.

To Deb's family and friends, this action was a victory, for the prosecution would not want to open the trial again. In fact, the government dropped its case, because thus far it could not prove that Debs had deliberately planned to obstruct the mails.

The victory dinner to which they all treated themselves turned into a sad affair. The company heard the newsboys on the streets: EXTRA! EXTRA! EUGENE DEBS TO BE SENTENCED TO SIX MONTHS BY JUDGE WOODS!

Debs paled. "Clarence, can they deny us another jury trial?"

Darrow was more stricken than his client. "Yes. Judge Grosscup evidently is going to withdraw the criminal charge against you, that is, that you planned to obstruct the mails."

"Can Judge Woods take over?" Debs asked.

"The court order -- that injunction -- which ordered you to put a stop to the strike was cosigned by Judge Woods, Gene. You failed to stop the strike by order of the court. That's contempt of court: disrespect for the authority of the court. He can send you to jail for the lesser charge, contempt of court."

"Without a jury trial, only a hearing?"

"Yes. It's all very legal. The court order can be issued to prevent injury to you or injury to railroad property," Darrow further explained.

"It was supposedly issued to prevent injury to railroad property. I tried to uphold that part of the order. But the government didn't give me any alternatives. During the strike they denied me the right to persuade or talk to the railroad men who quit their jobs and the right to help anybody who had quit." Debs continued, "I was told not to answer questions or to send telegrams."

"Sure, you were denied your right to speak and write and assemble. But the order must be obeyed."

"We realized that when we decided to ignore the order, Clarence."

"Gene, I don't think a restraining order should ever be used against organized workers in these labor disputes. But they are. At any rate, I think the Managers' Association wanted to get you to prison. And I'm sorry."

When Debs arrived at the small Woodstock jail where he would spend the six months' sentence, his face was caked with coal dust and grime and his hands were blistered. He had stoked the boiler of the engine himself. He thought the ordeal was good: he had become soft.

His stay at Woodstock marked the turning point in his life. First, he organized, along with the other five union men charged with contempt of court, a rigid daily routine for study and self-improvement. Because Debs had had to quit school when he was 14, his ambition was to learn to move people through his words, to be able to speak confidently, and to concern himself with the social problems of this world. He had no desire for wealth.

So the men studied, read, debated, and wrote to request from their friends more and more books.

Secondly, Debs reflected on his life: at 45, he felt he was a failure. He appreciated the work of Samuel Gompers. He knew Susan B. Anthony, who was fighting for women's rights. These crusades were meaningful to him. Debs thought about the ideal society.

Deb's ideal for American society would ask for the right of every man to work and to share in the benefits of that work. He felt that to achieve this society, labor would have to turn to political action. This would be his crusade: to organize workers to support a political party that could achieve economic

security without broken heads and loss of liberties.

Upon his release, Debs plunged himself into his new work, which was to last the next 25 years of his life: the formation of the Social Democratic Party.

PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE: PART V

Ellory Schempp attended Abington Township High School near Philadelphia. After the morning bell each day, Ellory listened to ten verses read from the Holy Bible: read without commentary, explanation, or interpretation. The Bible reading, coming over the public address system, would be followed by recitation of the Lord's Prayer, the students standing reverently by their desks in their homerooms. These morning exercises closed with the flag salute and announcements of interest to the students.

The morning exercises, between 8:15 and 8:30 a.m., were conducted from the public address announcement room by students attending the school's radio and television workshop and were supervised by a teacher.

For months and months Ellory had resented the morning Bible reading and prayer, but he swallowed his resentment, for he felt that he could not voice his concern. As a Unitarian, he had been taught that he did not have to accept as absolute truth the Bible stories as they were written. Although he was not required to believe in the Bible verses, his required presence in the classroom was an infringement on his liberty to "think and believe as he wanted to."

In addition, he thought that the public school should pay more attention to the First Amendment to the Constitution, which said that Congress should not make laws establishing a religion. The Fourteenth Amendment made that

principle, and others in the Bill of Rights, binding on all the states.

Ellory, a very likable and popular boy and a good athlete, resolved to do something about the morning devotional exercises. He knew it would be difficult to protest that portion of the morning exercises which would be considered religious. He knew that Pennsylvania law made Bible reading compulsory; and the law made no exceptions for dissenting minority students. The Pennsylvania law, passed in March, 1949, specified that ten verses from the Bible would be read each morning.

Ellory knew that any teacher refusing to read the Bible could be discharged. All teachers in his township system had been given a copy of the King James version, a Protestant Bible, and it was from this version exclusively that the verses were read. In schools not having an intercommunications system, the Bible reading and the recitation of the Lord's Prayer were conducted by each homeroom teacher, who chose the verses and read them himself or had students read them.

There were, then, reasons why students other than Ellory, including Catholics and Jews, might object to the Bible reading. But although they agreed with him in his objections, Ellory's friends were not going to argue with school authorities; it was easier to conform to what the law said and stay in the good graces of the school administration.

"It's foolish to get mixed up in an unpopular cause," they said, "even if the course of protest proceeds by law."

"The Pennsylvania law itself is 'unpopular' to me, if you put it that way," Ellory said.

"Perhaps you're right. But I can ignore it. The law doesn't effect me that much--so much that I don't get a good recommendation for a job," one boy said. "Anyway, Ellory, aren't you exaggerating the compulsory aspect of the law?"

"No, the way I see it, Pennsylvania law violates the guarantees of my choice of religion."

"You can't decide that. It's up to the courts. To say it is one thing; to follow through on the complaint is another thing," they said.

"I'm willing to call the violation to the attention of the courts," Ellory replied.

"How?"

"By protesting during homeroom. By calling it to the attention of the school first. Won't you support me?"

"No, Ellory, you'd better go it alone," they said.

Then Ellory had to go it alone. First he consulted his parents. Would they be willing to expend time and money in bringing suit against the school administration? As a minor, he could not bring suit in a case against the

school administration. But as parents and natural guardians, the Schempps could bring suit, with Ellory as a minor contestant and witness.

Should he proceed to protest the Bible reading and prayer, thereby forcing a case against the school district?

He realized that his younger brother, Roger, and his younger sister, Donna, both in public school, would be upset and possibly would be ostracized for what he was going to do. They might lose the companionship of their friends. And he knew that both Donna and Roger had often volunteered to read the Bible during morning exercises, and so they would never challenge the authority of their teachers or their school. He also realized that his father had never complained about the Bible-reading practice to the school officials.

The Schempps agreed to allow Ellory to go ahead and protest the school's violation of his religious upbringing. They would back him if he got into difficulties with the school authorities. The two younger children were to stay out of the protest. Ellory alone would demonstrate his objection.

Thus encouraged by his parents' decision, Ellory set out to show the school authorities that they were exerting religious persuasion on him contrary to his belief, demonstrating his objection by reading the Koran--the scriptures of the Moslem faith--while the Bible was being read. In addition, he refused to stand for the recitation of the Lord's Prayer and asked to be excused from attendance at the exercises.

By these actions, he bewildered his homeroom teacher, who had found Ellory a responsible junior up to this point. When Ellory claimed that the morning devotion "violated his conscience," his teacher sent Ellory to see the principal.

For the remainder of the year 1956-1957, Ellory sat out the devotional period of fifteen minutes in the Guidance Counsellor's office. Actually, under the arrangements in his high school, Ellory could not escape the sound of Bible reading, since the public address system reached all rooms in the school.

During his senior year, he was directed by the assistant principal to stay in his homeroom during the religious exercises, despite his request to be excused. He obeyed the direction, while continuing to protest. He felt that America's greatness had been built by men who put conscience before conformity.

The Schempps had filed suit in the Federal district court. Ellory decided to wait and see how the court would rule. He would accept its results one way or the other. He knew the procedure would take time.

The Schempp family (Edward Schempp, his wife, Sidney, and minor children, Ellory, Donna, and Roger), the superintendent of the Abington schools (O. H. English), and the principals (Eugene Stuhl of the High School and Edward Northam of the Junior High) had retained lawyers to prepare a case for the Federal court. In addition, the American Civil Liberties Union had agreed to Ellory's request to help the Schempps take their case to court. For

its part, the school district wanted the state law reviewed so that its position would be clear. On his part, Ellory meant to challenge the law, which infringed on his religious freedom.

Since the issue in the case concerned an interpretation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, the Federal court had jurisdiction over the case and therefore could hear it and rule on the constitutionality of the Pennsylvania law. This could be done even before the Pennsylvania state court could review the law.

In August, after graduation, Ellory's day in court arrived. The suit had been filed in the Federal district court near the end of Ellory's senior year. Indeed, the only "objector" or demonstrator--Ellory-- in the suit had no grounds to complain, since he was out of school. The court held that, as far as Ellory was concerned, the suit was doubtful. It seemed to the court, however, that the subject of the suit was important to hear and to consider. The parents, as guardians, had every right to bring suit, since "they had an immediate interest in their children's religious development." So the judges of the court decided to listen to Ellory's testimony, and his statements were recorded along with the statements of the others.

Ellory sat before Judges Biggs, Kirkpatrick, and Kraft in the United States District Court, Montgomery County, Eastern Pennsylvania. Ellory answered the family lawyer, Mr. Henry Sawyer.

"How old are you?" the lawyer began.

"Eighteen." Then he was asked to name his school and explain his purpose in protesting.

"Do you believe in God?"

"Yes," he replied.

"Do you believe that God exists in a human form or has human characteristics?"

"No," he replied.

"Ellory, do you believe in your own conscience in the concept of prayer that asks a favor of God?"

"No," he replied.

Then Roger Schempp, age fifteen, was questioned, "What do you believe about Christ?"

"I believe He was a great man," said Roger, "but I don't think He was some of the other things they claim He was."

Donna Schempp, age twelve, who had not wanted her older brother to begin his protest, also took the stand. "Where it says that the devil came to Jesus and tempted him, we have been taught that this was just a dream, and I don't think any man would have the powers to do the miracles that the Bible says He did."

The Schempp case became especially important when the Federal court

in Pennsylvania permitted religious experts to testify concerning the Bible and the Lord's Prayer, because the court had to decide whether the exercises constituted religious instruction.

At the trial conducted before this special panel of judges, Dr. Luther Weigle, formerly Dean of the Yale Divinity School, stated that portions of the Bible were basic to Christians and Jews; that its reading did not favor Christians over Jews. He added, however, that the reading of particular passages of the Bible to the exclusion of the others would favor one religion over the other.

Dr. Solomon Grayzel, a rabbi, testified that there were portions of the New Testament that were offensive to Jewish tradition; he cited instances which tended to bring the Jews into ridicule or scorn. While Dr. Grayzel conceded that such material from the New Testament could be explained to Jewish children in a way that would do no harm, the reading of the sections, without explanation, could be psychologically harmful to children of the Jewish faith.

The court came to these conclusions: (1) the Bible is a religious work; (2) the practice required by the Pennsylvania law amounts to religious instruction; (3) the practice favors Christianity.

Having heard the evidence, on September 16, 1959, the three-judge Federal court declared the Pennsylvania law unconstitutional according to the guarantees of the First and Fourteenth Amendments.

The court asserted, furthermore, that the Pennsylvania law also violated the Constitution because it infringed on the religious freedom of the teachers who were required to observe the law. The court felt there was a certain compulsion operating on the children, because there was no clause in the law which would excuse them.

The court also expressed the view that the rights of parents were interfered with by compulsory Bible reading. Judge Biggs wrote: "If the faith of a child is developed inconsistently with the faith of the parent and contrary to the wishes of the parent, then this law is wrong."

This decision, however, did not end the matter. The Abington Township School District prepared the case for appeal to the Supreme Court.

While the school board was appealing the decision to the United States Supreme Court, the Pennsylvania legislature amended the law to provide that any child bringing a written request from his parent could be excused from participation in the daily Bible reading. The amended law gave the Supreme Court the opportunity to "vacate the appeal and remand the case" or send the case back to the District Court for further consideration in the light of the amendment to the Pennsylvania law.

During the first trial, Mr. Edward Schempp had declared that he would not have Roger and Donna excused (they were in Junior High School) from these ceremonies. He claimed they would be labeled as odd-balls before teachers

and classmates. Children were liable to lump all religious differences or religious objections together, as being something connected with un-Americanism. He pointed out that, since morning exercises began with the Bible reading and prayer and ended with the flag salute and announcements, excusing the children from Bible reading would probably force them to miss hearing the announcements. Besides, being excused meant standing in the hall, and that seemed more like a punishment. The result again would be an obvious pressure to attend the devotional exercises.

Jurisdiction to review the case was again noted by the Federal court, and these statements were again reviewed and summarized. By this time, Ellory, as one of the contestants, was dismissed from the action, since he had long since been graduated from high school.

The amendment to the Pennsylvania law caused no change in the attitude of the same three-judge court, which, on February 1, 1962 reaffirmed its 1959 decision that compulsory Bible reading was unconstitutional. This second declaration that the reading was unconstitutional was again appealed by the school district to the United States Supreme Court, and in the fall (October) of 1962, the Supreme Court agreed to pass on the legality of the Bible reading.

The Schempps were fighting for religious liberty, an American principle, yet there were some members of the community who were ignorant of these principles.

"Bible-hater," they sneered.

"Commie! Go back to Russia," children yelled out of the school-bus windows as they passed the Schempp home.

Comparatively little abuse was directed toward them by adults. Mrs. Schempp spent many hours on the telephone explaining her position. One Protestant minister supported the Schempps, and the Jewish community was almost unanimously sympathetic.

A prayer issue had already been before the courts and the public before the final decision on the Schempp case was decided by the Supreme Court. In fact, Mr. Sawyer intended to use the examples of previous cases involving religious liberty when he presented the Schempp case to the Supreme Court.

He explained to the family. "The New York Board of Regents had composed a prayer which the public school children in New York would recite."

"I recall that Justice Black ruled against that made-up prayer," Mr. Schempp replied.

"Yes, Justice Black explained that it wasn't the business of the government to compose official prayers for any group of people to recite."

"Didn't this decision last year become unpopular and cause a lot of hard feeling against the Court?" Ellory asked.

"You're right. Various members of Congress have introduced bills to overrule the Supreme Court decision by amending the Constitution," explained Mr. Sawyer.

"All prayer hasn't been declared unconstitutional yet," Mr. Schempp said.

"It will be, if the Supreme Court upholds the decision of the Federal district court in your favor. You see, despite the fact that the Supreme Court has ruled for the past twenty years on individual cases of religious freedom, there has never been a case just like yours, with the same circumstances, the same questionable state law, the same facts. The Court has to review your case separately."

"Won't they fall back on any decisions they've made in the last few years for guidance?" Mr. Schempp asked.

"Yes. It's customary to refer to them. I, myself, am going to refer back to a case decided in 1943. It involved children of Jehovah's Witnesses."

"Those children who refused to salute the flag?" asked Mr. Schempp. "Wasn't it against their faith to put the flag above God by saluting the flag?"

"Yes," Mr. Sawyer replied, "but the flag salute isn't a religious ceremony. You see how each case differs slightly."

"How did the court decide?" asked Ellory.

"The Court said that the flag salute had to be voluntary."

The Supreme Court reviewed the testimonies in the Schempp case in February, 1963. It was argued before a packed courtroom for two successive days. There were many would-be spectators outside the courtroom. The

nine justices knew they had an explosive issue on their hands, and they came into court prepared to ask questions of the lawyers rather than just to listen to arguments.

The question before the court was whether the state, through the local schools, could select and direct the prayers of children, subjecting to ostracism anyone who did not want to participate.

During the sessions Justice Black leaned forward and interrupted the case presentation of the two opposing lawyers many times. He demanded to know: "Is there any reason why if you can have three minutes for Bible reading you can't have forty?"

"How can you say this is not a religious ceremony based on the Christian Bible?"

"How can you assume there is never any pressure on a child when he has to step aside?" Justice Black was hard to convince that no compulsion was used.

Justice Warren tried to find out from the Pennsylvania state lawyer what he would recommend in a Hawaiian community which was 51% Buddhist and 49% Christian. "Would the Christians walk out during a Buddhist service?"

Justice Goldberg asked if it would be all right for the schools to use the Book of Mormon.

"Yes, sir," the Pennsylvania state lawyer replied.

Justice Black leaned forward again. "You're suggesting that the Constitution gives a local option as to what brand of religion would be taught in schools?"

The lawyer insisted the devotional exercises were for moral and disciplinary reasons.

Clearly, the justices had something to think about during the next four months while they wrote their decisions.

In their closed conference chamber after the hearing, after shaking hands and arranging themselves around the conference table, each Justice, according to seniority, expressed his views on the evidence presented. All of them, except Justice Stewart, were convinced that devotional exercises in public schools were unconstitutional.

Justice Clark, a Presbyterian, Justice Brennan, a Catholic, and Justice Goldberg, a Jew, were assigned the task of writing the Court's opinion in separate but agreeing opinions. They decided to announce their decision at their last meeting in June, and the schools could decide what to do during the summer vacation.

Justice Clark, speaking for the Court, banned all Bible reading and use of the Lord's Prayer in American public schools as parts of a religious exercise. Freedom of religion cannot survive if the majority could use the machinery of the state to spread its beliefs.

He concluded in his statement: In the relationship between man and religion, the State is firmly committed to a position of neutrality."

Justice Brennan's long and brilliant opinion revealed his knowledge of the history of church-state relations in America. He suggested that children learn from the heritage of all American groups and religions.

Justice Douglas realized there would be public misunderstanding of the decision, as there had been following the Regents' prayer decision the year before. Therefore, he said that the Bible was worthy of formal study as a course in a secular program for education. He emphasized the financial aspects of state support for any church activity: "It is not the amount of public funds expended; it is the use to which public funds are put."

The Court, in its deliberations, did not need to dwell at all on religious differences, since it was necessary only to show that the school in this case was supported with tax funds. The Court did not mean, as its critics implied, that prayer should never be used in official public ceremonies.

Donna, Roger, and Ellory Schempp are now far away from these conflicts. Yet Ellory's protest against and challenge to the existing Pennsylvania law brought about a policy change in accordance with the Court's decision. The public school administrators reorganized their morning exercises and reconsidered the purposes of religious celebrations held in school. Certainly alternatives were available. Local school boards issued prayer bans to implement the decision and substituted a moment of silent meditation.

TEACHER'S GUIDE TO ACCOMPANY

STUDIES ON PROTEST AND DISSENT IN AMERICAN LIFE

Program in American History and Civilization

Division of Secondary Social Studies

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

Copyright©The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs, 1969
Tufts University

I

General Teaching Objectives

1. To understand that political protest (and also labor strikes) may be the result of intolerable economic conditions.

2. To understand that extreme economic pressures of foreclosure and debt among the poor may lead to rebellion.

3. To believe in the legal processes set up for the redress of grievances.

4. To understand how serously riots and acts of violence result in injury to persons and property.

5. To evaluate riots and acts of violence as possibly being cases of conspiracy playing on hatred rather than of real grievances.

6. To understand why some working and living conditions are challenged by workers, as "unfair."

7. To study a major strike as an example of economic boycott.

8. To feel, as Debs did, that labor (and any group) has the right to organize.

9. To realize that changing a law by using the judicial process is difficult and yet is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

Foreword

American history has often beeen concerned with events of protest and dissent. This particular selection of events presents only a few aspects of protest and, for the most part, is an arbitrary selection of episodes which cuts across several decades. The narratives are an attempt to show various methods of protest against different oppressions ranging from revolt against the law by armed resistance to getting an objectionable practice eliminated by a fresh interpretation of the Constitution through the law courts.

An interesting and highly important fact is pointed up, namely, that even though the Constitution gives us certain rights, we must demand them. If we do not claim our freedom from imprisonment for debts (Part I), our freedom from racial discrimination (Part II), our freedom to assemble and speak (Part III), our freedom to work under fair conditions (Part IV), and our freedom to practice (or not to practice) our religious beliefs (Part V), others may take them away.

II

Explanatory Notes On The Narratives For Students

A. Historical Notes

1. Captain Perez Hamlin, although he never fought beside Shays in the rebellion, led a separate force of insurgents. The incidents involving Captain Hamlin in the narrative are fictional. Captain Hamlin was wounded and taken prisoner in the battle with Lincoln's forces; but there is no record of his career after his imprisonment.

2. There was a little suspicion that the draft riots were a conspiracy instigated by Confederate spies as well as by Copperhead sympathizers, but no conclusive proof was produced. While the daily events of the riots are factual, the characters are entirely fictional.

3. Both Lingg and Schnauboldt were members of an anarchist group in Chicago. Lingg's suicide trial are a matter of record. Schnauboldt was arrested, questioned, and cleared of suspicion. He left Chicago. His involvement in the riot in the narrative is fictional.

B. Relevance to the Present

It is suggested that before formal study of the narratives, students should discuss a current topic or event involving protest, emphasizing the method which is used to achieve its goals.

1. 1787 The narrative concerning Shays' Rebellion needs little preliminary explanation in its example of redress of grievances where no machinery for redress existed. After the reading, however, the problems of the Critical Period in American history and the decisions for a federal-type government should be discussed. The narrative suggests the following problems which students should recognize: inflationary currency; total state sovereignty; loose structure of the legal system; no legal restraints among Vermont, New York, and Massachusetts; the conflict between farmer and merchant.

2. 1863 The narrative concerning the draft riots seems more analogous to the ghetto race riots of the past few summers than to the antidraft protests. The waste and destruction and despair resulting in an act of violence should be clearly understood by students. Here was a real

grievance totally misdirected and misguided. A background filmstrip on the economic causes of the Civil War will help students to understand the northern immigrant's attitude toward his own "free labor" and competition with "freed" Negro labor. The narrative deals sufficiently with a time setting.

3. 1886 -1894 The narratives concerning the Haymarket riot and the Pullman boycott illustrate important developments in the history of labor's organization and recognition as a group. Although the narratives serve to illustrate the use of the strike and boycott as a form of protest, a discussion of the previous historical problems of unionizing trades and industries would serve as needed background for these two crises.

   The narratives should suggest the following to the student:

   a. The poor living conditions of the immigrant worker in the late 19th century

   b. The conflict between hand labor and mechanized labor with a shorter workday

   c. The political and nonpolitical allegiances of the immigrant worker, understood and misunderstood by those in authority

   d. The seeming alliance of the workingman with anarchist or socialist causes, in not accepting the capitalist framework of American society

   e. The difference between trade and industrial unions

   f. The (implied) procedure for "calling" strikes

   g. The need for labor to work through a political party

   h. The need for incorruptable leadership among working groups.

4. 1963 Many students may remember the school prayer ban and will identify with Ellory Schempp in his decision to challenge the constitutionality of the Pennsylvania law. Here is an example of peaceful protest: the process of a court appeal. The issues that were before the court are as important as the procedure for appeal, although the guarantee for minority religious rights was not mentioned in the decesion of the higher court.

The question of loyalty should be raised in terms of the conflict between allegiance as duty to one's country and allegiance as duty to one's faith.

A background filmstrip (or any other visual aid) on the history of religious liberties (even beginning in the colonial period) may be helpful for the student.

Supplementary information will be needed to explain the following:

a. The aims of the American Civl Liberties Union

b. The process of appeal through the Federal court structure

c. The use of precedents in decisions

d. The make-up and personnel of the Supreme Court

The narratives have been tested for their readability level. One sample from each narrative has been tested with the following result: The average reading-grade level is seven plus. The difficulty range in all five narratives runs from a reading-grade level of five plus to eleven plus.

C. Varieties of Protest and Dissent

It is of great importance to remember that the United States Constitution protects the right to protest and dissent except in cases of personal injury or injury to property or in cases of riot. Oftentimes a distinction is made by society between what is permissible protest and dissent and what is impermissible, therefore, protest is tolerable depending on when and how it is made. These legal and moral variables often help to explain why mass movements are accepted in one era or by one generation and not in another.

Varieties of protest are:

1. A vocal objection, written or spoken

2. An act (sometimes accompanied by vocal objection)

   a. picketing

   b. boycott by demonstration or communication

   c. peaceable mass assembly

   d. mass demonstration

   e. individual demonstration

3. A ballot or vote

   a. petition

   b. referendum

   c. legislative process

   d. formal organization of a group brought together for one purpose

4. A court decision and the process of appeal

5. Civil disobedience, deliberate violation of law when it is considered unconstitutional or in opposition to a higher law of conscience

D. Conditions for Protest Which Lead To Civil Disobedience

1. When an oppressed group is deprived of lawful channels for remedying its condition or when methods of due process in both legal and political systems are anavailable

2. As a means of resisting or refusing to participate in an intolerable evil perpetrated by civil authorities

3. When government takes or condones actions that are inconsistent with values on which the society and political system are built

4. When it is certain that the law or policy in question violates the Constitution and therefore, if challenged, would be ruled unconstitutional by proper authority

5. When a change in law or policy is demanded by social or economic need in the community and the normal procedures of law are inadequate or are obstructed by antilegal forces

6. When the actions of government have become so obnoxious to one's own personal ethics that one would feel hypocritical in submitting to that law which enforces these actions

III

Teaching Strategies

A. Part I

1. Discussion questions to check basic understanding of the narrative:

   a. Why were the jails full? Were the farmers' grievances real or imaginary?

   b. Were the people of Stockbridge justified in emptying the jail and stopping the court?

   c. What method was used to accomplish this?
   What were the alternatives available to the people?

   d. What were the simple solutions suggested by Ezra for their problems? Were their problems resolved by their actions?

   e. What would the suspension of habeas corpus mean to these people?

   f. Were Shays's actions acts of rebellion? Do his actions compare with the methods used in a "sit-in"? Explain.

   g. The expression "read the riot act" is often used. What does it mean?

   h. Was Captain Hamlin a man who advocated violence?

   i. Was the punishment severe for those who were rebellious? the crowd? the leaders?

   j. What was the relationship between the states during the "critical period"? Give evidence from the narrative.

2. In addition to the questions based upon the content of the narrative, further discussion may involve an analysis of these statements made by the persons of the narrative:

   a. "We were fools to have elected a General Court to do something for us."

b. "Leave matters of government to /your/ betters."

c. "This is high treason."

d. "I haven't done anything I'm ashamed of."

3. The classroom may serve as a demonstration area to show how individuals may lose rights. By imposing on the student's freedom of action, the teacher may demand more respect and formality each day; for example, insisting that they stand when contributing to the discussion, refusing permission to leave class to attend assemblies, etc.

4. The account of Shays' Rebellion gives the student an opportunity to evaluate the first "sit-in" in American history. He should become aware through the narrative that this "oppressed group" were deprived of their lawful channels to redress their grievances by petition before the First Amendment to the Constitution made the procedure of petition a matter of right. The method of protest should be discussed, beginning with the Shays narrative, and reviewed with each of the other narratives. (see "varieties of Protest and Dissent, "p. 5)

5. The Redress of Grievances: A Problem

   a. How can a student protest within the framework of the law (school rules and regulations)? Have the students list complaints which they have against school regulations or make a list of reforms which they feel would improve school life for themselves and others. For example, complaints may involve compulsory study hall, ristircted library hours, the variety of food and drink in the cafeteria, etc. What is the procedure for having these complaints aired? What are the alternatives when the complaints are not resolved?

   b. What will happen if a student disregards all constituted authority?

6. As a related topic which also has an early historical setting, students may want to study the problems of the seaman and his impressment which resulted in protest (mutiny). A reference can be made to Herman Melville's well-known novel, Billy Budd.

B. Part II

1. Discussion questions to check basic understanding of the narrative:

   a. Was the workers' grievance justified?

   b. How did James score points with the workers?

   c. Explain the term Copperhead. Is this kind of sentiment typical in any given conflict?

   d. What were the alternatives for defense against this kind of riot?

   e. What was the result of the reckless action of the mob?

   f. What was the original goal of the "protest"?

   g. Compare the procedure for choosing men for the draft now and during the Civil War.

2. Further discussion may involve an analysis of these statements made by persons of the narrative:

   a. "Give us a chance for our lives."

   b. "You've struck a blow for liberty."

3. In connection with the reading of the draft riot narrative, introduce the topic of "Freedom of Speech: When Does It Become a Danger?" Obviously Lewis's intent was to incite riot, and the question may arise as to whether, as in a similar circumstance, Lewis would have been allowed to say what he did, regardless of the sympathies of his listeners. In other words, should free speech have been denied to him? There are many Supreme Court cases which deal with some of the interpretations of the First Amendment. The following cases tie in with the subject matter of the theme and the narrative.

   a. The Schenck case deals with the question of when free speech becomes a danger. The circumstances of the case dealt with the illegal (Espionage law of 1917) distribution of leaflets to drafted men by the Socialist Party. The leaflets were statements opposing the war. The decision of Justice Holmes and the Court involved the statement, "free speech does not protect a man in

falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing panic." The war, they had decided, was a special situation.

b. The Feiner case deals with the question of whether the police can stop a man who in his public speaking is deliberately calling for violence. The circumstances of the case dealt with Feiner's calling for Negroes to rebel or riot to obtain their demands. The personal safety of the speaker was challenged by someone in the crowd. The decision was that the police cannot be used to stop unpopular opinions, but can stop a call to riot. The Court claimed that in freedom of speech one could cause people to be angry by the statements made, but no one might call for violence. A call to riot might do away with free speech.

Ask the students to make up situations involving either written or spoken statements where the proper or improper use of words may be a danger to free speech.

C. Part III

1. Discussion questions to check basic understanding of the narrative:

   a. What motivates an anarchist? What methods might he use to accomplish his goals?

   b. How would the workingmen's clubs become involved in problems of everyday life?

   c. What was the primary goal of labor in the 1880's?

   d. What were the methods used by laboring men to organize their protests?

   e. Were the strikers justified in their grievances against the McCormick works?

   f. What decisions had Lingg and Schnauboldt made before they began their acts of violence?

   g. What alternatives were available to Lingg? To the strikers?

   h. What were the consequences of Schnauboldt's act of violence?

2. Have the students identify some groups in American society which have brought about change through organization. This identification may be by common interest or work such as the following: laborer, farmer, woman, student, teacher, policeman, fireman, Negro. Have the students determine the success or failure of these groups historically and in the present day in their attempts to organize to bring about change. Have they organized to bring about change to benefit themselves or others? What kind of leadership was required of each of these groups?

3. At the end of the narrative, Schnauboldt suggests that he is not certain that his role of assassin can be justified. What are the motivations of an assassin in contemporary society?

D. Part IV

1. Discussion questions to check basic understanding of the narrative:

   a. Did the Pullman workers have just and serious grievances? What were they?

   b. Had all peaceful avenues for settlement of their problems been exhausted? Explain.

   c. What reason could the railway men give for their quitting work in sympathy?

   d. How was the court order--injunction--used against the strikers?

   e. Was Debs wrong in ignoring the court order? What were his alternatives?

   f. How did the Pullman boycott turn into a major conflict between the forces of labor and those of industry?

2. In addition to the questions based upon the content of the narrative, further discussion may involve an analysis of these statements:

   a. "The only thing that can defeat the strike now is violence."

   b. "You run your union as a business."

3. Role Playing: The manufacturer of Judy Bond blouses relocated the blouse factory from New York to Georgia. When the manufacturer left New York to establish a new factory in the South, he broke a contract which had been made with the International Ladies Garment Workers' Union representing the union workers in the factory. The workers, then, were left without jobs, and there were no jobs open to them in other garment factories which would offer them the same salary and benefits as they had been receiving.

   a. You are the owner of the Judy Bond factory. You have been called before a mediation committee to explain your actions.

   b. You are a leader in the ILGWU. You have called a meeting of the union members to decide a course of action. It is your job to make recommendations for a course of action by the workers.

c. You are a union member in good standing for the past 15 years, and you worked for the "runaway" factory. Your opinion is representative of many other members. You should make suggestions on a course of action and vote upon it.

d. You are a union official attempting to organize the nonunion factory which recently moved to the South and meeting with a great deal of opposition.

Two forms of protest actually were used by the union. A picket in front of stores selling the Judy Bond blouse, distributed small items with the "Don't Buy Judy Bond Blouses" label of them. The union also sued the company for breach of contract and for back wages lost. These would be usual procedures for similar situations.

4. In a role-play situation, have the students defend Pullman's position, that he can decide whatever working conditions and wages he chooses.

5. Under consideration is a national police union, which was generally favored by the big-city police departments. Already established is a National Patrolmen's Association in order to create a better public image for the policemen. Have some students defend the idea of a union instead of the existing Association.

6. In the general area of labor history, there remain for related study:

   a. The Homestead strike where an injunction was used to break up the strike. The Colorado miners' strike is a similar situation.

   b. The Molly Maguire movement, an earlier example of labor protest.

   c. Debs's career after the Pullman strike, as Presidential candidate for the Socialist Party and his imprisonment for sedition in 1919, rounds out the preliminary biographical data in the narrative.

E. Part V

1. Discussion questions to check basic understanding of the narrative:

   a. How did Ellory indicate that he was aware of the consequences of his protest?

   b. Why did Ellory challenge the law? What knowledge did he bring to the decision to protest the Pennsylvania law?

   c. What portions of the United States Constitution applied to Ellory's challenge to the Pennsylvania law?

   d. Was it necessary for Ellory to recruit others (groups or individuals) to support him? Explain.

   e. How did the Court reason in its decision?

2. A study of other religious minorities in the United States, such as the Amish or the Mormons, may point out how a problem is resolved when religious practices are in conflict with the law or what happens when American society accommodates dissent within the existing system.

3. Another case brought before the Supreme Court at the same time as the Schempp case, and perhaps more familiar to the students, is the case of Murray vs. Curlitt.

4. In a decision in February, 1969, in the case of Tinker vs. Des Moines Independent Community School District #21, The Supreme Court emphasized that school children's rights of free speech are limited to conduct that does not disrupt discipline or interfere with the rights of others. The school principal was judged wrong in ruling against the use of armbands by the students protesting the Viet Nam war. Many commentators felt that the ruling would make it difficult to censor publications in the school. Have the students consider this decision along with discussing legislation which would provide a maximum penalty of 90 days in jail and a fine of $150 for persons engaged in campus demonstrations.

IV

Vocabulary

A. Part I

(to be) sued
Court of Common Pleas
debtor
creditor
foreclosure
insurgents
treason
Riot Act
habeas corpus
retaliation
effigy
disaffected counties

B. Part II

Copperhead
abolitionist
malicious bosses
alienated
inciting to riot

C. Part II

workingmen
anarchist
socialist
unionize
"scabs"

D. Part IV

sympathy strike
boycott
injunction
contempt of court

Besides these words found in the narrative, other words that are part of the basic vocabulary in any study of labor history are as follows:

arbitration

blacklist

conciliation

grievance committee

mediation

picket

warrant

E. Part V

Unitarian

First Amendment

Fourteenth Amendment

compulsory, compulsion

to bring suit

jurisdiction

ostracized, ostracism

Federal district court

Koran

appeal

contestants

V

Attitude Test on "Protest and Dissent in American Life"

Note: These attitude questions have the objective of stimulating discussion, using the viewpoint held by the students, so that a set value is not imposed on the student.

Write the word agree or disagree after each of the following statements and then explain your answer briefly.

1. Protest demonstrations are an act of irresponsibility.
2. People who participate in protest demonstrations are irresponsible.
3. Considering the situation of the Stockbridge farmers, they should not have been punished for rebelling.
4. Hatred and dissatisfaction are good reasons for organizing protest demonstrations.
5. Any draft law is unjust which favors the wealthy class or any one group over another.
6. It is important to believe in the purposes of a war before one fights.
7. Persons who are in debt and owe money have a right to protest peacefully.
8. Those forms of protest which lead to injury to persons and property can usually be justified.
9. The law was the law. All debtors at the time of Shays' Rebellion should have paid what they owed or have gone to jail.
10. No reason that can be given would be worth going to war for.
11. The best way to avoid being drafted is to go out and demonstrate against it.

12. The best way to resolve any grievance quickly is to riot.

13. A group of individuals becomes a mob when it destroys property.

14. Since the riots in New York did not end after four days, force was the only way to meet force.

15. Anarchists believe in violence.

16. Having any sympathy with the workingman means that one is a socialist.

17. A person who is a "scab" should realize that he may be harmed.

18. Assassins are usually anarchists.

19. Louis Lingg was not guilty of a violent act because he did not throw the bomb.

20. Louis Lingg was innocent of committing any crime against society.

21. It is the right of any employer to hire and fire whomever he wants and for whatever reason.

22. If a union worker makes a complaint, the company manager has a good reason to fire him.

23. The use of violence is necessary in a strike situation.

24. The Pullman workers were right in overturning the railroad cars.

25. The Pullman strike failed because the workers used violence.

26. The best way to end a strike is to issue a court injunction against it.

27. To protest the recitation of the Lord's Prayer in a public school is a valid issue.

28. One should support a protest demonstration only if it involves a popular cause.

29. The law courts can best decide the outcome of a protest issue.

30. It is all right to break a law when it is considered unconstitutional by a majority of the people.

31. The government should have forced Mr. Pullman to give in to the worker's demands.

32. No employer should fire a worker engaged in organizing a union.

33. A company should not hire a person who refuses to join a union.

34. Workers have more power over their employers than employers have over their workers.

35. When a worker will not accept the employer's terms, he should go to another job.

Content Test on "Protest and Dissent in American Life"

A. True or False

1. Many protestors are needed to make a demonstration successful.

2. Perez Hamlin was not willing to take his punishment, so he fled to New York State.

3. Perez Hamlin did not believe in the right of petition.

4. Perez Hamlin felt that the only action open to the people of Stockbridge was open rebellion.

5. The people of Stockbridge demonstrated against the judges because the judges had the power to jail them.

6. There were no alternatives to violence when the people of Stockbridge tore down the jail.

7. The people of Stockbridge attacked the judges because the judges refused to find a solution to their grievances.

8. The real motive for fighting the Civil War was profit.

9. There were no alternatives to violence when the New York crowds occupied the Colored Orphan Asylum.

10. Someone had to be punished for throwing the bomb in the Haymarket riot.

11. Louis Lingg was hanged because he despised the authority of the government.

12. The Pullman workers had been given no alternatives when they quit work.

13. A court injunction may be used to stop a strike.

14. The Pullman workers made use of what is now an accepted form of protest.

15. Eugene Debs displayed disrespect for the authority of the court.

16. Eugene Debs was prevented by the government from talking to the strikers.

17. Ellory Schempp challenged a law which he believed was unconstitutional.

18. The right to challenge a law is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

19. Freedom from imprisonment for debts is guaranteed to all citizens.

20. Freedom from racial discrimination is guaranteed to all citizens.

21. Freedom to assemble and speak peacefully is guaranteed to all citizens.

22. Freedom to work under fair conditions and to organize unions is guaranteed to all citizens.

23. Freedom to practice or not practice our religious beliefs is guaranteed to all citizens.

B. Short Answer

1. What were the economic conditions in each of the narratives which led eventually to dissatisfaction and protest?

2. What were the acts of violence which resulted in injury to persons and to property?

3. From the narratives, what were the real grievances? What kinds of grievances are reasonable?

4. Describe as many methods of protest as you are able.

C. Situations

1. Abraham Lincoln once advised citizens who suffered from hunger as a result of war: "Take your pickaxes and crowbars and go to the granaries and warehouses and help youselves."
Was this good advice? Why or why not?

2. "It is far better to put your hands in your pockets and remain nonviolent and then 'raise Cain' with the money situation." How could organized teenagers carry through a protest using this policy?

VI

Resources

1. Additional readings in Merrill Proudfoot, Diary of a Sit-In, and Abbott E. Smith, White Servitude and Convict Labor in America, 1607-1776, make interesting background comparisons.

2. Films

   a. "Sit-In" (NBC-TV White Paper Series, 1961) in two parts. Distributed by McGraw-Hill Textfilms Division. 54 minutes

   b. "Civil Rights Movement-The South"(NBC-TV production, 1966). Distributed by Encyclopaedia Britannica Films. 28 minutes

   c. "The Rise of Labor" (NBC-TV Production, 1963). Distributed by Encyclopaedia Britannica Films. 30 minutes

   d. "The Inheritance" (Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America) in two parts, 1965. This film is made from still pictures and news clips dating from 1901 and presents an excellent historical summary of the twenties and thirties as well as a catalogue of labor history. 58 minutes

   e. "Freedom of Religion" (NBC-TV Production, 1963). Distributed by Encyclopaedia Britannica Films. 30 minutes

   f. "Harvest of Shame" (CBS-TV, 1960) deals with the migratory workers' attempt to organize. Distributed by McGraw-Hill Textfilms. 54 minutes

3. Resource persons might include organizers for local labor unions who could speak to students about the goals of their unions.

4. Students like to share their record collections with others. Ask them to bring in particularly good protest songs for which they can explain the backgrounds.

VII

Bibliography

Bellamy, Edward, The Duke of Stockbridge. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962

Blanchard, Paul, Religion and the Schools. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963

David, Henry, The History of the Haymarket Riot. New York: Farrar & Rinehart, Inc., 1936

Debs, Eugene, Writings and Speeches of Eugene V. Debs. New York: Hermitage Press, Inc., 1948

Douglas, William O., The Bible and the Schools. Boston, Little Brown & Company, 1966

Fortas, Abe, Concerning Dissent and Civil Disobedience. New York: Signet Books, 1968

Fribourg, Marjorie G., The Supreme Court in American History. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Macrae Smith Company, 1965

Ginger, Ray, Altgeld's America. Chicago, Illinois: Quadrangle Paperbacks, 1965

_____, The Bending Cross. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1949

Harris, Frank, The Bomb. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1963

Kogan, Bernard (ed.), The Chicago Haymarket Riot. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company, 1959

Manning, Thomas (ed.), The Chicago Strike of 1894. New York: Henry Holt & Company, 1960

McCague, James, The Second Rebellion. New York: Dial Press, 1968

Minot, George Richards, History of the Insurrections in Massachusetts. Boston: James W. Burditt & Company, 1810

National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence, Rights in Conflict (Walker Report). New York: Bantam Books, 1968

Rice, Charles E., The Supreme Court and Public Prayer. New York: Fordham University Press, 1964

School District of Abington Township v Schempp 142 Oct. 374 U. S. 203

Starkey, Marion L., A Little Rebellion. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955

Stone, Irving, Adversary in the House. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1947

Werstein, Irving, July 1863. New York: Ace Books, Inc., 1957